INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND VERBAL BEHAVIOUR

IN THE NEW ZEALAND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (1987-88)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the Degree

of

Masters of Arts in Psychology

in the

University of Canterbury

by

James Conner

University of Canterbury

1991

CONTENTS

PAGE

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES CTD.... PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to Bruce Jamieson for his supervision of this thesis as well as his helpful comments and suggestions. I am still not sure whether to thank or reprove Bruce for suggesting Hansard as an information source. It is hardly necessary to add the time-honoured note that his help does not involve any responsibility for any shortcomings of this study. I am also grateful to Karilyn Smith for typing the various drafts of the manuscript. Her excellent organisational skills and attention to detail made the task so much easier.

A special note of appreciation to my wife (Hinemoa Meri), son (James Alexander), and mother (Sarah Tracey) for their patience and support during the lengthy periods of cloistering while the manuscript took shape. Although my son, as a very busy ten year old, will probably never have the time to read this thesis, he is very much a part of it.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to both my mother and late father (Alexander Wilson) for providing me with such a secure and happy home environment. An environment where independent thought, the ability to stand up for one's convictions, and the need to treat our fellow human beings as equals, and with dignity and respect were always nurtured.

ABSTRACT

Although there are a small but substantial number of studies which have examined how the mass media portray industrial relations, there are few, if any, on how politicians portray such matters.

This study analysed in detail the content of industrial relations language as spoken by some politicians in the New Zealand House of Representatives. A content analysis was performed upon twelve sample Hansard issues and two elected industrial relations bills over a one year sample period, from October 1987 to September 1988. It was directed at the amount of coverage and type of industrial language appearing in parliamentary debates, the manner in which it was presented and by whom, and the types and characteristics of participants who appeared in the debates. The findings were also compared with the way in which the mass media portray such matters.

It was found that industrial relations receives a good deal of attention from politicians and that they do not avail themselves equally of the opportunity to speak in the House. There was a marked difference between some of the industrial relations topics considered of high public value by politicians and those topics considered of high public value by the news media. The economic context of industrial relations featured the most prominently whereas industrial action was hardly mentioned. Negotiating behaviour received only a small amount of attention and the tone of debates was relatively equally spread between being conflict creating and generally mixed, not ascertainable, and neutral. It was also found that politicians were concerned with the actions or affairs of a wide range and large number of participants, and that no one participant type was overwhelmingly prominent. The implications of these findings were explored in industrial relations, political, and public perceptions contexts. Suggestions for further research were also discussed.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

In modern society people come to perceive a great deal of the world through the eyes of others. Verbal messages, rather than direct experiences, have considerable impact on our daily lives, whether it be reading a book or newspaper, listening to the radio, watching television, or networking with world-wide information systems. Verbal language has a variety of important functions, one of these being to convey political messages. The language of politicians is of prime importance because, like that of the mass media, it has the ability to shape public consciousness and create reality on a wide range of issues and at a variety of levels. This ability becomes even more potent when the media, mass communication, and the language of politicians occur in combination. Although there is a substantial body of theoretical research in the diverse field of political communication, there has been very little empirical research on the verbal behaviour of politicians in Parliament.

Another area of paramount importance in our daily lives is the activity of work; work in the sense that it produces something of value in our lives, in particular a degree of economic self-sufficiency, social interaction, social status, and identity. Provided, of course, that the work concerned is sufficiently challenging and rewarding. It is within this context, especially in Western industrial democracies, where the industrial relations process and the interaction between workers, employers, and the government becomes important. Public perceptions and attitudes in this area are also important. They may have a direct effect on the formulation of

industrial relations policy at the government level, or on the outcome of a specific dispute at the local, regional, or national level.

The ability of the mass media and politicians to shape public consciousness and create reality in this area is well recognised. This is particularly so in New Zealand where at least historically, state involvement has been a good deal higher than in any Western industrial countries. However, the area of industrial relations and the mass media has produced only a small but substantial number of research studies in New Zealand. Furthermore, as far as the author is aware, there have been no in-depth studies on how politicians portray industrial relations concerns in this country.

Aims

The aims of this investigation are two-fold. First, to analyse in qualitative and quantitative terms the content of industrial relations language as spoken by some politicians in the New Zealand House of Representatives. The analysis is directed at the amount of coverage and type of industrial relations language appearing in parliamentary debates or business, the manner in which it is presented and by whom, and the types and characterisation of participants or organisations who are referred to in the debates.

The study also attempts to examine the general pattern of those debates with industrial relations content, and seeks to contribute observations regarding New Zealand parliamentary debate. Who debates and who does not? Which political party or politician is the most conciliatory in verbal behaviour? What are the rankings of the politicians who move the debates? What were the outcomes of the debates in question? These are the types of questions addressed.

The second aim is to compare by way of commentary the above research findings with the way in which industrial relations news is presented by the New Zealand news media. Thus, in a broader sense the study attempts to shed light on the nature of political and media input into media-derived public perceptions of industrial relations issues and situations.

The study is exploratory in nature in that the treatment afforded the important area of politicians and industrial relations has been the subject of very little research both in New Zealand and overseas.

Thesis Overview

The thesis is organised in the following manner. This chapter deals with the background and context of the study as well as the aims of the investigation. Chapter Two reviews the theoretical and empirical literature in the areas of investigation, namely industrial relations and the news media, and political communication. It consists of a review of each major area under a series of sub-headings, followed by a brief summary. Chapter Three consists of a rationale statement which deals with the question, "why carry out this study?" This is followed by a brief outline of the New Zealand House of Representatives, its form, functions, and procedures.

Chapter Four outlines in detail the methodology adopted for the investigation. This includes the various sampling issues and a detailed content analysis. The key concepts and definitions are also outlined. The main results of the study are presented and discussed in Chapter Five according to two major sub-headings: amount of coverage, and subject matter. Chapter Six provides a discussion of the research findings focusing on both specific and general concerns. The study is also critically analysed and directions for further research are suggested. Chapter Seven draws some general conclusions from the study.

The thesis closes with a list of references cited in the study. Finally, copies of materials used in the investigation are included in the appendices.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a background to the present study by means of a review of the literature in the relevant fields of research. Since the study involves two broad and distinct areas of research, namely industrial relations and political communication, the literature is reviewed under each area with appropriate sub-headings. First, industrial relations is reviewed in the context of its presentation by the news media. This is reviewed under four sub-headings: amount of coverage, subject matter, participants and spokespersons, and explanations of coverage and content. Next the broad and diverse area of political communication is discussed, followed by the relevant areas of research: verbal language and politics, and verbal behaviour in legislative assemblies. This latter area of research is reviewed according to overseas and New Zealand literature.

2.1 INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND THE NEWS MEDIA

2.1.1 Amount of Coverage

Industrial relations is generally regarded by news editors and media professionals as a permanently newsworthy topic. It has been established, for example, that metropolitan newspapers devote between one and two percent of total area newsprint to industrial relations, television programmes around five percent, and radio news programmes around nine percent, with more in the evening than the morning (Cordery, Jamieson, & Stacey, 1978; Hartmann, 1976). Furthermore, newspapers print many letters from readers on industrial relations, often featuring them prominently, and industrial

relations is also a popular topic for editorials, particularly those of the public concern or moralising type (Cordery et al., 1978).

Maharey (1977), cited in Cordery (1978), found among a sample of four major metropolitan daily newspapers a daily average of 212 column inches of industrial relations news - more than a complete page of news over the four newspapers.

An English study by Hartmann (1976) investigated the industrial relations news content of five daily newspapers, two daily television newscasts, and one radio news programme over a period of eight weeks. He found that the greater available newspace, the more industrial relations news was carried, with the bigger papers carrying more than the smaller papers, and the broadcast media, with their severe time restrictions, carrying the least of all. He estimated the amount of space given to industrial relations as between one and two percent of the total area of newsprint, with a daily average of 156 column inches. These average figures would be higher if the considerable space given to advertising and sport were disregarded. By comparison, the two television channels averaged about five percent and the radio news nine percent of their total broadcast time with a daily average of about 199 seconds.

A New Zealand study by Cordery (1978) investigated the industrial relations content of eight daily newspapers, three daily radio news programmes, and four daily television newscasts over a period of ten days in 1977. The eight newspapers produced about 17 complete broadsheets (or pages) of industrial relations news, at an average of about two broadsheets per newspaper. Radio and television produced totals of 45 and 36 minutes over the ten day period respectively.

As with the Hartmann (1976) study, those papers and programmes with the greatest available news space or time produced the most industrial

relations news, with the exception of the radio Morning Report (i.e. National Programme, 7.00 a.m. to 8.00 a.m.). This, Cordery (1978) suggests, is possibly due to the fact that the Morning Report, in question, tended to have a large overseas and sports news content, while its counterpart, the Evening Report (i.e. National Programme, 6.00 p.m. to 6.30 p.m.), tended to focus on events of local significance.

Harbridge (1983) investigated the industrial relations content of three daily newspapers, with a combined net circulation of 392,253, over a three month period in 1982, with seven days selected as control days. The three daily newspapers selected for his study were the New Zealand Herald, The Evening Post, and The Star (a morning and two afternoon papers respectively). Industrial relations news occupied 46,142 standard column centimetres in length, amounting to about 82 pages of industrial relations news among the three dailies. The majority of industrial relations material appeared in news items (87 percent), letters (eight percent), editorials (three percent), and features and cartoons (one percent each). A feature article was defined as an article that could be published at any time, is not dependent on immediacy or recency for its placement, and which attempts to background some particular issue on industrial relations.

Page (1984), in response to the Harbridge (1983) study, commented that a story's worth and significance cannot be judged by the amount of space it takes on a printed page. Furthermore, measurement by ruler cannot differentiate the degree of importance of what is written; it can establish only the importance of the amount of space that a particular piece of writing occupies. Page maintains that the methods used in the Harbridge (1983) study fail to recognise this. He stated that

> "a diamond takes less space than a wad of dollar notes yet is far more valuable for all that" (p.45).

However, the studies indicate that even the most casual of readers, listeners, or viewers is likely to come into contact with at least some industrial relations news on any given day. Cordery (1978) concluded

> "that considering the size of the audience reached by the media, sufficiently large amounts of industrial relations reach the general public daily for such information to be regarded as an important factor in the shaping of public consciousness in this area." (p.78)

2.1.2 Subject Matter

Hartmann (1976)

In studies relating to the mass media it has generally been found that certain types of events or subject matter are more likely than others to become news. Hartmann (1976) examined this proposition by classifying industrial relations news items into one of ten categories, according to their themes. The most prominent category focused on conflict, namely that of 'industrial action' (42 percent), followed by the 'actions and statements of unions, other than industrial action or negotiations' (24 percent). All other kinds of subject matter fell well behind these categories and included: 'negotiations' (about nine percent), 'state agency' (six percent), 'political action/statements' (about six percent), 'work and conditions' (about four percent), 'other' (about three percent), 'economic context' (two percent), 'employers action/statements' (two percent), and industrial developments (about one percent). This pattern of coverage was broadly similar across all papers and programmes in Hartmann's (1976) study. Furthermore, these similarities held in spite of real differences in the political orientation of each newspaper and the types of audience targeted for.

In Hartmann's (1976) study 'industrial action' consisted of items relating to the many forms of overt industrial action such as the strike or

lockout, go slows, and work to rule. Of those items whose main topic of subject matter was 'industrial action', the majority were about ongoing action and about a quarter on impending action. According to Hartmann (1976) this is a pattern which is fairly characteristic of the general run of industrial relations news.

For those items recorded as 'industrial action' a record was also kept of the causes and effects of the action. In 84 percent of these items causes were given, and in 82 percent effects were given, with on average just over one cause and one effect given per item. The most commonly given cause was 'dissatisfaction with wages' which appeared in 40 percent of such terms, followed by 'opposition to pay policy' (23 percent), and 'union instructions' (11 percent). The most commonly stated effect was reference to some kind of 'disruption or reduction in efficiency of the enterprise' (32 percent), followed by 'loss of production' (19 percent), 'layoffs' (18 percent), and 'inconvenience or danger to the public or customers' (17 percent).

Hartmann stated:

> "Overall, the most noteworthy thing about the news presentation of causes and effects of industrial action... was the very limited range of factors referred to and the superficiality of the analysis given..." (p.11).

Hartmann (1976) suggested that there are good reasons why his and other studies show that news characteristically tends to focus on conflict. In his view people find matters of conflict and deviance interesting. In addition, this information has a social importance as an indication of points of strain in the social structure. The emphasis on strikes, he asserted, gives substance to the common complaint of trade unions officials that their involvement in disputes is highlighted in the media, whilst the greater part of their day-to-day work, that deals with peaceful negotiation

and the improvement of working conditions and safety, is ignored. This reinforces the impression in the public mind that unions are disruptive rather than constructive or useful.

Hartmann (1976) also noted how seldom the actions or statements of employers form the subject of industrial relations news. It would seem this happens, not because their activities are neglected by the media, but because they are seldom reported in an industrial relations context. The actions and statements of the Government, politicians, or state agencies by contrast feature six times as often as those of employers, thus reflecting, possibly, the high degree of state involvement in industrial relations.

Glasgow Media Group (1970)

The superficiality of the news media's analysis of industrial action was also noted by the Glasgow Media Group (1970), cited in Cordery (1978). They found that television news tended to emphasise strikes in some areas and completely ignore them in others, seemingly shifting their attention from one dispute to another without reason or regard to their continuance. Furthermore, it was found that news reports rarely stated whether or not a strike was official, and that the unions involved were rarely named explicitly. It was also found that the causes of most disputes were assumed to be money or remuneration, despite the existence of readily available statistics showing that up to one-third of all industrial disputes concern non-monetary matters.

Morley (1973)

As with the Glasgow Media Group (1970) study, Morley (1973), cited in Cordery (1978), found that the media portrayed a certain image of the price-wage system. While price rises were presented as merely 'happening', wage claims were presented as being 'actively 'made'. According to Morley

trade unions are generally presented as the sole active and responsible agents in dispute situations; their actions and decisions being portrayed as the only reason for the existence of the dispute. Correspondingly, the authorities are usually presented as being 'helpless' in the face of action by the trade unions.

This shallowness in the media's portrayal of disputes is described by Morley (1973) in terms of an 'event orientation' on the part of the media which in turn leads to the presentation of 'actuality without context'. He noted that media coverage of disputes tends to focus on the immediate form of events, and on what happened and who was involved, thus ignoring the underlying context of the situation, and rarely offering any analysis of the relationship between particular events and underlying structural processes.

Cordery (1978)

Cordery (1978), in a New Zealand study, found, as with overseas studies, that the predominant subject matter of industrial relations news concerned 'industrial action', although not to such a large extent as that found in some studies. His results showed that about 30 percent of the main media items addressed themselves to 'industrial action', a figure considerably lower than those obtained by Hartmann (1976) and Maharey (1977). Cordery suggests that this comparatively low level of attention to 'industrial action' may have been due to the fact that the period covered by the study from, 7 March to 18 March (1977) inclusive, was one containing relatively few instances of industrial action. However, he noted that the broadcasting media devoted a far greater proportion of their coverage to this type of subject matter than did the printed press.

A further analysis of items falling within the category of 'industrial action' showed that the majority of such items were about returns to work, or the ending of action. This, suggested Cordery (1978),

may reflect a tendency, by the media, to regard the resumption of normal working relations as the most important issue in dispute situations, regardless of the number of relevant issues involved.

Negotiations, notwithstanding the vital role they play in the industrial relations process, accounted for about 11 percent of the total subject matter. Almost all of the negotiation items concerned wages and allowances with only a modest number of items, about ten percent, referring to conditions of work as a topic of negotiation. Furthermore, the general picture presented by such negotiations was rather gloomy with only 38 percent of such items making any reference to favourable progress of some kind. By way of contrast, about ten percent of such items described the situation reported as a stalemate, with a further eight percent stating that negotiations had collapsed or broken down. Unwillingness of the parties to agree or negotiate was reported in 12 percent of items, with unions portrayed as the unwilling party on the majority of occasions. In addition, over three-quarters of the negotiation items related to negotiations in the public sector, between the Government and unions. Cordery (1978) suggested that this may well mean that such parties are seen as possessing less militant attitudes than their counterparts in the private sector.

Of all the parties involved in industrial relations the actions or statements of unions and their spokespeople make the news most often. This category accounted for about 27 percent of all items, nearly as many items as those relating to 'industrial action'. Within this category about 12 percent of items were reports of intra-union disputes. This feature had also been pointed out by Morley (1973), who had noted that news coverage tends to highlight inter-union aspects of disputes such as demarcation issues. In contrast, the actions or statements of employers and their associations were the subject of only about ten percent of all items.

Cordery (1978) noted that this figure derived solely from the reports appearing in the newspapers, and that the bulk of such reports were not concerned with 'every day' industrial relations matters but related to 'one-off' situations.

The actions and statements of the Government and others in the political arena also appeared in about ten percent of all items. According to Cordery (1978) this reflects the extent to which the Government is a major participant in industrial relations in New Zealand, both as the legislator and as an employer. It also reflects the importance of the Government as a prime source of information. Cordery's results showed that the then National Government was the subject or source of 78 percent of such items, compared to the then Labour Opposition with about 20 percent of items. Cordery also noted the almost complete lack of diversity in reported political comment and activity. Only one item in this category concerned a political identity outside of the two major parties.

It is increasingly apparent from the studies already mentioned that, while a few topics in industrial relations receive a large amount of coverage, many important topics are passed over by the news media. Cordery (1978) found that items falling within the category of 'economic context' accounted for only 0.5 percent of all items. Similarly, but slightly higher, 'state agencies' accounted for only about five percent of all items. 'Work and conditions', 'industrial developments', and 'other' were topics similarly under-reported with about six percent of all items each.

Cordery (1978) commented that the media present a very selective picture of what is happening on the industrial relations scene. As with previous studies he found that the bulk of industrial relations news is directed at instances of industrial action, negotiations, and the actions or statements of unions, whereas other areas of importance fail to get the

coverage they deserve. He suggested that this is not to say that the media are actively ignoring such areas and put forward a more likely explanation, also suggested by Maharey (1977), namely that the media may accept as news only those items or topics which are brought to their attention. Thus, apparently lack-lustre topics such as industrial developments, economic conditions, and work and conditions do not attract the attention of the news media and fail to become news. Cordery also expressed concern that the patterns in the coverage of the various topics within industrial relations are the same for all papers and programmes. This, he suggested, cannot but help to reinforce audience perceptions of the news as a true reflection of the nature of events in the outside world, thus, increasing the credibility of the news presented by the media.

As in the Hartmann (1976) study, Cordery (1978) found that the most commonly given 'cause' of industrial action was 'workers' dissatisfaction with wages and allowances' which appeared in about 40 percent of such items. This was followed fairly closely with 'dissatisfaction with working conditions' (about 28 percent), and 'opposition to employer action or policy' (about 24 percent). A long way behind were the categories of 'union instructions' (about six percent), and 'opposition to Government action or policy' (about three percent).

Cordery (1978) commented that the most striking aspect of these results was that only about six percent of all causes were attributed to groups other than workers or unions. Furthermore, over half of the causal statements consisted of only one sentence. Thus, in the majority of cases, no attempt was made to explain the reasons for a dispute in any degree of detail. According to Cordery, the likely effect of such superficiality is that the media audience are likely to judge the industrial relations issues at stake as trivial. By extension, he suggested that unions and workers,

who are consistently portrayed as causing such action, are likely to be seen as irresponsible and petty.

Cordery (1978) identified 12 major categories of 'effect' as opposed to only eight 'causal' categories. The most commonly stated effect was 'non-specific references to some form of general disruption or drop in the efficiency of an enterprise', which appeared in about 54 percent of such items. This was followed, a long way behind, by the categories of 'specific, quantified production loss' (about 13 percent), 'inconvenience to the public or consumer' (about nine percent), 'little or no effect' and 'economic hardship for business' (five percent each), and 'hardship to workers and families', 'physical danger', 'layoffs and suspensions', and 'change in industrial practice' with about three percent each. Cordery also noted that when effects were given they were discussed in much more detail than were causes. He also found that over five percent of all the items analysed contained neither cause nor effect.

Cordery, Jamieson, & Stacey (1978)

In another New Zealand study, based on the Cordery (1978) thesis, Cordery, Jamieson, and Stacey (1978) commented that the main focus of industrial relations news is upon a category of events usually termed 'industrial action'. They noted that there were only three other categories of subject matter regularly featured as industrial relations news: the statements or actions of trade unionists, the statements or actions of politicians, and employer-employee negotiations. They also noted that the economic context of industrial relations is neglected in the news and that employers and employer associations are not featured to the extent that trade unionists and unions are. Furthermore, the media ignore the bulk of ongoing industrial relations activity and present industrial relations news

which is biased towards conflict, disruption, threat, disaster, abnormality, and deviancy.

According to Cordery et al. (1978), news items are inevitably time-bound since news has to be produced by the media every day. This means that events which can be conveniently processed within the 24-hour cycle are much more likely to become news than events which unfold slowly or at an uneven or irregular pace. In practice this means that a good deal of reliance is placed on official announcements, political speeches, statements by prominent figures, and exchanges between politicians and trade unionists.

Cordery et al. (1978) also noted that with events categorised as 'industrial action' distinctions between official and unofficial strikes, and between strikes and lockouts, are not made consistently. Lockouts are often described as strikes, whereas causal explanations for disputes are typically superficial and trivial. They stated that clichés, stereotypes, crude images, black and white issues, and generalised characteristics of industrial conflict are common place in the news. Employees are more frequently presented as being morally wrong than morally right, whereas people who make a great deal of money or large profits with a company are presented as benefactors of the nation and as outstanding citizens.

Harbridge (1983)

Similarly, in another New Zealand study of three major newspapers, Harbridge (1983), found an emphasis on conflict in the media's presentation of industrial relations and the absence of any in-depth analysis of the reasons for the reported conflict. He found that about 55 percent of all industrial relations items were about disputes and the likely effects of those disputes. Items classified as 'policy matters' accounted for about 27 percent of all items, followed by 'other matters' (i.e. personnel, insufficient information, other), accounting for 19 percent of all items.

Harbridge (1983) set aside a separate category for those items concerned with the 'wage-tax trade off', as this was foreseen by him as an important policy matter for 1982. He found that only about three percent of items were on this topic and commented that

> "the wage-tax issue contained important issues which needed clarification and explanation for the public, yet the newspapers failed to background these issues...". (p.19)

Harbridge (1983) supported the previous studies by commenting that the media, in simplifying greatly the industrial relations events they cover, provide insufficient background information and pay too little attention to causes and effects. Consequently, industrial relations events, as news, are trivialised and sensationalised.

Page (1984)

In a response to the Harbridge (1983) article, Page (1984) suggested that an emphasis on manifestations of conflict by the news media is hardly surprising given the importance of conflict in the history of industrial relations and its enshrinement in the adversarial system of our labour law and institutions. According to Page, since industrial conflict can either directly or indirectly influence people's incomes and way of life, then its reporting deserves an important place in the news. Although Page acknowledges that the need for greater analysis and backgrounding on the reasons for conflict, he noted that it is often difficult to be able to do this. Tempers can flare, and key people may wish not to be quoted or to say anything that may exacerbate the situation or bring retribution. Furthermore, the relevant parties may not want to expose bargaining strategy or to be seen to be making concessions.

Page (1984) noted that the period of the Harbridge (1983) study covered the first quarter of 1982, which included most of the long summer

break with its reduced news volume. Also, during this period, the significant award negotiations are coming to an end, and specialist reporters may be on holiday for part of the time. These factors, according to Page, would influence the frequency with which industrial relations matters would arise as news and the manner of its treatment. He also rejected the notion of a conspiracy among newspapers over the reporting of industrial relations. In his opinion the explanation of perceived bias in the reporting of industrial relations does not easily fit with an academic theory or measurement, and that there are so many other human variables which researchers should explore. Page believed that by failing to explore these variables, Harbridge's (1983) study was vulnerable.

In response to Page's (1984) article, Harbridge (1984), rebutted the criticisms made by Page. Harbridge defended his behavioural approach and maintained that this approach ensured that the industrial relations features identified were objective. Harbridge also asserted that Page failed to address the issue of why sub-editors treat industrial relations items differently from other types of items. Harbridge also noted that Page justified reportage of industrial conflict on the grounds that work stoppages can influence people's income or cause considerable inconvenience. However, Harbridge noted that although accidents of work and industrial disease lead annually to far more working days lost than does industrial conflict, they occur far more infrequently as news items. Harbridge concluded that the media must take a lead in attempting to portray industrial relations matters in a serious rather than trivial and sensational manner.

In conclusion, the results of the studies, in relation to 'subject matter', show that the news media present a very selective picture of what is happening in industrial relations. The bulk of industrial relations news

is directed at instances of industrial action or conflict, with trade unions usually being presented as the sole active and responsible agent in dispute situations. The shallowness and superficiality of the news media's analysis of industrial relations was also apparent.

2.1.3 Participants and Spokespersons

Hartmann (1976)

In the Hartmann (1976) study a record was made of the types of participants referred to in each industrial relations item. The results were a summary of the frequency of appearance of types of participants, rather than the actual number of actors. Thus, the data were collected in such a way that if three trade unions were reported in one item, the category 'trade union' would be checked only once for that item. What emerged from the Hartmann study was the extent to which industrial relations news items are concerned overwhelmingly with the actions of workers and/or their representatives. Employers appear frequently but not nearly so often as do workers and unions. The importance of the Government in industrial relations was also apparent from the data. This group appeared nearly as often as employers or managers.

Overall, 'workers' appeared in 84 percent of items, followed by 'unions or union officials' (68 percent), 'employers or managers' (47 percent), the 'Government' (46 percent), and the 'trade union movement' (30 percent). A long way behind were 'state bodies' (16 percent), 'shop stewards' (12 percent), 'employers in general' (11 percent), and 'employers associations' and the 'public' (ten percent each).

Hartmann (1976) also recorded when a participant was quoted either directly or indirectly. This occurred for just over a quarter of the total participants recorded. 'Trade union officials' were quoted in 36 percent of

such items, followed by 'employers or managers' (17 percent), 'trade union movement' and individual 'workers' (eight percent each), the 'Government' (seven percent), and 'shop stewards' and 'state agencies' (five percent each).

In addition, Hartmann (1976) noted the way in which different participant types were characterised by the news media. He found sharp differences in the relative frequency with which terms or adjectives were used to describe participant groups. Workers were characterised most often; on 43 percent of the occasions on which they appeared. Next came 'trade unions, trade union movement, and their officials', considered jointly, who were characterised on 22 percent of occasions, and the 'Government' (ten percent of occasions). The favourite adjectives applied to groups of workers were 'low-paid' (61 times), 'militant' (55 times), 'angry' (38 times), 'divided' (22 times), and 'moderate' (11 times). Unions, and the trade union movement, were presented in a very similar way, being called 'militant' (40 times), 'divided' (16 times), and 'angry' (15 times). Although Government and employer participants were characterised far less frequently than were workers or unions, the adjectives most commonly applied to both of these types of categories were 'confident', 'determined', 'firm', or 'tough'.

Cordery (1978)

Similarly, Cordery (1978) found that workers and unions featured most prominently in industrial relations news items, appearing in about 70 percent of items in each case. These were followed by 'Government' (about 46 percent of items), 'employers' (specific) (about 25 percent of items), and 'state bodies' (about 25 percent of items). Next came 'employers' (general) (about 14 percent of items), 'employers associations' (11 percent of items), 'interest groups' (ten percent of items), and 'civil servants'

(about nine percent of items). In comparison, directors, shareholders, the Parliamentary opposition, retailers, local bodies, experts, and the public appeared hardly at all.

A similar pattern was observed by Cordery (1978) in the type and frequency of participants quoted. 'Union officials' were quoted in 51 percent of items. 'Government', on the other hand, was only quoted in 16 percent of items, followed by 'employers' and 'employers associations' (12 percent of items each), and 'Federation of Labour' (nine percent of items. 'workers', 'directors', 'opposition', 'retailers', 'interest groups', 'local body members', 'experts' and the public were hardly mentioned.

Cordery's (1978) findings on characterisation also showed that 'unions' were the participant types most often described and included terms such as 'concerned' (four times), 'unruly' (five times), 'fragmented' (four times), 'unhappy' (four times), 'split' (three times), and 'firm' (three times). 'Workers' were described as 'militant' (two times), 'frustrated' (two times), 'confident' (two times), and 'unhappy' (two times), whereas the 'Government' was often described as being 'hopeful' (four times).

Cordery, Jamieson, & Stacey (1978)

Cordery et al. (1978) also commented that it is clear from studies of the media that the participants featured in industrial relations news are most frequently from workers and their organisations rather than from the Government, employers, state bodies, or the general public. They reported that researchers in Britain have found that there is a difference both in the frequencies with which the news media characterise participants by the use of adjectives, and in the type of adjectives applied. Participants from the workforce are most frequently characterised, usually in a negative way. In New Zealand the news media characterise participants far less frequently than is the case in Britain. About one out of seven or eight New Zealand

news items characterise the participants but there does not seem to be any clear pattern in the way they are characterised, with the exception of a somewhat positive characterisation of Government participants.

This latter exception, according to Cordery et al. (1978), is significant because Government involvement changes the news potential of industrial conflict for several reasons. First, the Government has more power and a wider scope for action than a private employer, and its electoral support gives it a particular type of legitimacy which the private employer lacks. The Government, for example, can threaten its own public employees with more severe penalties than can private employers by invoking both roles, that of employer and that of the Government. Second, a Government is always able to promise change or new legislation which may well be newsworthy. It is also likely that Government statements and actions will cause controversy, and possibly become good news. Finally, Governments these days indulge in what Cordery et al. term 'news management' and the functionaries of Government use news people, sometimes willingly, sometimes unwillingly, to this end.

Harbridge (1983)

Harbridge (1983) also recorded the frequency with which participants in industrial relations news items were reported. Employer and employee representatives were noted according to whether they were locally or nationally based representatives. National and local employers were reported in about 13 percent and 14 percent of items respectively, whereas national employees were reported in 27 percent of items, and local employees in about 20 percent of items. Politicians appeared in about 19 percent of items, and Government officials in about eight percent of items.

In addition the affiliation of each politician reported was recorded. More Labour politicians were reported than National politicians, 50 percent

versus 40 percent respectively. However, National politicians were reported in more individual items than Labour politicians, 119 items as against 73 items respectively. Harbridge (1983) explained that the reason more Labour politicians were reported overall, was because in 37 percent of cases where one Labour politician is reported, at least one further Labour politician was also reported. However, in only seven percent of cases where one National politician was reported were further National politicians reported. In comparison with other groups, politicians have maintained a relatively high industrial relations profile, being reported in about one item in five. This finding, commented Harbridge, was not surprising as the state in New Zealand has always maintained a high level of involvement in industrial relations.

Harbridge (1983) also suggested that employee representatives may be pleased with the comparatively high level of coverage they receive. Although he makes no assessment as to whether the coverage is fair, he suggested that the frequent reporting of employee representatives may indicate a willingness on the part of journalists to invite comment and then publish that comment. In comparison he noted on the low coverage given to comments from Government officials in the news media. Harbridge stated:

> "Third party independents may have some valuable insights into the causes of disputes and industrial relations issues yet they are seldom reported." (p.20)

In conclusion the results of the above studies show that industrial relations news items were concerned largely with the actions of workers and trade unions. Furthermore, these groups are usually characterised in a negative way. Employers also appear frequently but not as often as do workers and trade unions. The importance of the Government in industrial relations is also apparent, appearing nearly as often as employers or

managers. However, these three groups were characterised much more favourably than workers and trade unions.

2.1.4 Explanations of Coverage and Content

Cordery, Jamieson, and Stacey (1978) acknowledged that there have been several attempts to explain the manner in which industrial relations news is presented, especially the media's emphasis on conflict, economic disruption, and trade unions. One attempted explanation emphasises the social visibility of disputes and strikes, and their significance as a source of economic loss. Thus, trade unions and their members are more likely to be highly profiled in the news, given their relationship to events that are socially disruptive, overt, and, at times, spectacular. However, Cordery et al. rejected this explanation on several grounds. First, many disputes and strikes are not overt in the sense of being obvious and visible to the public. Their social visibility in the form of conflict relates largely to what the media are looking for and wish to bring to the attention of their audiences. Second, it can be argued that the financial costs of disputes are exaggerated in the news media, with accidents, illness, and alcoholism all being more important sources of economic loss than is industrial conflict, and all arguably having worse general consequences.

Another explanation, according to Cordery et al. (1978), is based upon the argument that industrial relations events involving conflict are prominent in the news because media professionals regard them as highly newsworthy. Having a high news value means that the news media attract and retain an audience as well as adding to the audience comprehension of the events and personalities involved. It is argued, therefore, that reports of conflict enable people to utilise a range of stock notions and stereotypes about conflict in general. Associated with this are journalistic beliefs about 'bad news being good news'. Focusing the attention of the public on

conflict and fostering beliefs that the consequences of conflict are excessive and costly allows news professionals to interpret the news as a cause for public concern and as indicative of a need for something to be done.

Cordery et al. (1978) also put forward a third explanation. This involves the idea that industrial relations news production is shaped within the media by an interpretive framework based upon particular ways of perceiving society, its institutions, and its values. Such an interpretive framework arises largely from the political and economic circumstances in which the media operates and are part of. It involves the acceptance of concepts, ideas, practices, and values with biases which support the economic and industrial status quo, as well as the acceptance of middle class values and traditions which include laying the blame for industrial relations conflict with the workers. A variant of this argument, according to Cordery et al., is that the media present industrial relations news within a framework largely pre-defined by powerful elites, particularly owners of the media, large scale advertisers, and the Government. They stated:

> "Whilst diversity and variation, with a plurality of views, is permitted in news presentation, it takes place within limits set by political and economic imperatives originating in the centre of power which the media represent." (pp.61-62)

Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978) commented that traditionally, discussions of the way in which the news media portray industrial relations items centres around the question of 'bias'. According to Hartmann (1976) the question implicit in the idea of bias can be more satisfactorily answered by using the notion of 'differential legitimacy'. He stated:

> "Specifically, we need to ask what kind of actions and whose actions are typically presented as being legitimate or illegitimate, and what kinds of consequences are characteristically associated with the actions of different parties. This gives a fuller

> description of the broad framework of meaning in which the news media's coverage of industrial relations is organised." (p.16)

According to Cordery (1978), because the results of his study and the Hartmann (1976) study are very similar, it is not surprising that a similar conclusion is reached as to the pattern of 'differential legitimacy' in the news media's presentation of industrial relations. Stated in broad terms, coverage accords less legitimacy to the actions of workers and their representatives than to other participants in industrial relations. However Cordery conceded that the reasons for the existence of 'differential legitimacy' are not apparent from the results of his study. Although he suggested that such reasons may lie in the influence of the political, social, and economic environment in which the media are forced to operate.

The preceding review of the literature on industrial relations and the news media showed that even the most casual of readers, listeners or viewers is likely to come into contact with at least some industrial relations news on a given day. Not only are certain types of industrial relations events or subject matter more likely to become news but also certain groups or participants are more likely to appear than others. In addition there are sharp differences in the way the different participant types are characterised. Various attempts to explain why industrial relations news is presented in this matter were outlined.

The focus of the literature review is now shifted from that of industrial relations and the news media to a related but distinct area of research, namely political communication.

2.2 POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

The literature on political communication generally emphasises this field of research as an emerging and substantive field of inquiry (Chesebro, 1976; Nimmo & Sanders, 1981). Nimmo and Sanders (1981), in what is perhaps

the most comprehensive collection of essays in the field, presented a cross section of the key theoretical approaches, areas of inquiry, and methods of study in this diverse field. They traced, briefly, the origins of political communication from the works of Aristotle, Sun Tzu, St Thomas Aquinas, Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and others to its emergence as a cross disciplinary field in the 1950's, to a healthy, thriving substantive field of inquiry in the 1980's.

In general, modern writers in the political communication field resist specifying the substantive content of the field or defining the field's boundaries. Chesebro (1976) commented that although the definitions, scope, and parameters of political communication vary widely among scholars, they are unified by their common attempt to identify the relationship between symbolic activity and politics, and by how this relationship is to be perceived, articulated, and researched. Nimmo and Sanders (1981) also noted the absence of consensus amongst scholars regarding definition and boundaries. They maintain that the field's current immaturity and diverse antecedents make it a pluralist endeavour that, as yet, defies neat characterisation.

The various theoretical approaches to the field of political communication are outlined in Nimmo and Sanders (1981) and it is not necessary to review the content of these theories here other than to note that there are marked differences amongst scholars on which approach to adopt. For example a structural versus process approach or cross-sectional versus developmental approach. Alternatively, approaches may derive from a particular academic discipline such as history, anthropology, or sociology. The majority of approaches, however, recognise that political communication is more than a mechanical linkage between communications bent on transmitting messages and passive audiences which readily accept them.

However, it is a matter of dispute on just how large a role human subjectivity plays in this relationship and how much that subjectivity is patterned or structured.

There are several key areas of inquiry which constitute the field of political communication. These include: verbal behaviour or rhetorical analysis, propaganda analysis, attitude change research, voting studies, functional and systems analysis, technological change, and Government-news media studies (Chesebro, 1976; Nimmo & Sanders, 1981). This latter area, Government-news media studies, although discussed within a different context, was briefly touched upon in the previous section. However, the major area of concern for this present study is verbal behaviour and politics.

The importance of verbal behaviour in politics cannot be overstated. For example politics in its most basic aspects has often been described as a symbolic and linguistic phenomenon (Chesebro, 1976). This vital interaction is demonstrated in two definitions of political communication put forward by Chesebro. The first refers to:

> "the verbal and non-verbal actions carried out by politicians or the study of the discourses of politicians" (p.290).

The second defines political communication as:

> "the study of the communication patterns or central symbols which create, mediate, and alter dominant or subordinate relationships wherever they occur..." (p.300)

This interaction between verbal behaviour and politics is reviewed in more detail in the next sub-section.

2.2.1 Verbal Language and Politics

Language

It has often been said that humankind's capacity to form symbols and words which represent phenomena of their external and internal world is their most distinguishing capacity. It is generally recognised that the nature and function of language cannot be disconnected from the social realm, and that language provides the opportunity for engaging in social interaction and cultural integration. According to Mueller (1973), whether one accepts Chomsky's conception of innate mental structures as the determining influence on linguistic development, or Piaget's theory of the decisive role of actions in cognitive growth, language acquisition and development cannot be disconnected from the environment. Furthermore, language conditions the individual to cultural patterns and establishes a link between the self and others, and provides the basis for self reflection and individualisation.

Graber (1976) commented that people in modern society perceive most of the world vicariously, often through the words of others. Verbal messages, rather than direct experiences, purport to tell people what is, has been, and will be, and supply people with reasons and values. Similarly, Edelman (1967) stated that:

> "language is not to be conceived as something which has meaning by itself. Its meanings are always a function of the context from which it issues, of the disparate needs and interests of the audiences involved, and of their respective modes of perception." (p.133)

According to Mueller (1973), since language has an integrating and differentiating function, it also has a political function and therefore must be taken into account in any analysis of political communication. He stated:

> "both socially restricted language and politically manipulated language can function as agents promoting the stability, whatever its attributes, of a political order... Language and political consciousness are elements that go hand in hand and which determine the way in which people relate to their environment." (p.19)

Political Language

According to Graber (1976, 1981) when verbal behaviour occurs in a context which has political significance it falls within the scope of "political language". Since millions of words are emitted each day in various political settings, the focus of any study in this field must be selective. Graber (1976), therefore, defined 'political significance' narrowly and referred to it as those verbal stimuli which contain political statements that reach or affect large numbers of people, the outputs of the mass media which convey information about politics, political messages by politicians or high ranking public officials, and verbal transactions in open or closed political meetings.

Political languages share the major properties of all languages and are the means for translating observations and ideas into vocal and visual symbols and transmitting these to others. Graber (1976) commented that what makes language political is not a distinctive vocabulary or form. Rather it is the substance of the information it conveys, the setting in which the information is disseminated, and the functions that political languages form. When political actors, in and out of Government, communicate about political matters, for political purposes, they are using political language.

Graber (1976), therefore, considered politics as largely a word game. Politicians rise to power because they can talk persuasively to voters and political elites. Once in power, their daily activities are largely verbal, involving commands, dialogue, debate,' formulation of policy and proposals,

laws, and legal opinions. The skills with which politicians wield the tools of political discourse, adapting them to the needs of various audiences and the goals to be achieved, determine their political success. Leaders of nations, political parties, and mass movements have traditionally been those who emerged as the most convincing spokesperson for their cause. Obvious examples from the present century include Lenin, Hitler, Mussolini, Churchill, de Gaulle, John F. Kennedy, and Martin Luther King. Although they represented a wide range of opinions and beliefs the one thing they all had in common was an extraordinary ability to captivate their audience, inspire crowds, and mobilise mass opinion (Atkinson, 1984).

According to Graber (1976) there are three special features of political discourse which give it special potency. First, the subject matter of political discourse generally deals with public affairs of concern to large numbers of people. Second, political discourse is likely to be significant because it involves major elites whose official positions put great resources for action at their disposal. Third, the impact of political discourse is also enhanced because the news media, conscious of the importance of such discourse, disseminate it widely to the public.

Graber (1976) stated:

> "Political discourse is extremely important because it deals with the major problems of public life. It describes them and, in the process, shapes them. Verbal images become the major form in which political reality is grasped. They become the basis for official action or inaction, and for the public's feeling of optimism or pessimism, content or discontent, about the course of political life." (p.197).

Political leaders use various forms of political discourse ranging from the reasoned arguments of statesman-like rhetoric, to the emotional appeals of charismatic oratory, and even the deceptive or irresponsible promises of popular speeches. All are attempts to persuade audiences to accept the speaker's views, but each style appeals to different response

mechanisms in the audience. However, to assure wide understanding and nearly automatic responses, tested phrases, clichés, and the use of body language abound.

Once verbal pronouncements by political elites have been widely publicised, they generally become binding commitments because the status of the sender lends weight to the message. Audiences believe that a pronouncement portrays present or future reality, and they adjust their own beliefs and actions accordingly. These public responses make cancellation of the verbal commitment costly in terms of physical and psychological readjustments and potential credibility gaps between political elites and their constituents. Graber (1976) found that commitments expressed by political elites, including presidential pronouncements in the United States, have been reasonably accurate indicators of later action. Thus, the patterns of verbal pronouncements permit a number of important political inferences. Analysts, for example, may be able to predict political leaders' likely responses to specific situations which may arise in the future. Conversely, a study of political leaders' reactions and conceptualisations in response to specific situations may permit analysts to infer the general principles which are guiding the leaders' actions.

However, despite its political significance verbal behaviour has received relatively little attention in political analysis. Graber (1976) attributed this to three reasons. First, there is the contention that verbal descriptions of reality are of secondary importance. Proponents of this view believe that reality takes precedence over verbal images, and that political researchers ought to study situations and relationships as they exist, rather than analysing their verbal images. Second, there are suggestions that the verbal output of politicians consists largely of distortions, lies, and half-truths. Third, even if verbal output can

indicate political reality, it is not necessarily the most reliable indicator, and other approaches to the study of political behaviour may be much more valuable.

Graber (1976) suggested that the above shortcomings have been exaggerated and should be viewed as hurdles, rather than as unsurmountable barriers to the analysis of verbal behaviour. For instance, she commented that the shortcomings of verbal data as tools for interpreting the political world and forecasting political behaviour are common to all social science data and can be improved by using appropriate research techniques. Likewise, the problems of outright lying and other forms of verbal distortion, which may be common in politics, can be analysed by message interpretation techniques which help in assessing the probability of distortion and in unravelling truth from falsehood. Moreover, she suggested that lies, half-truths, and verbal distortions often constitute powerful political stimuli which must be appraised quite aside from their correspondence to the truth.

Bloch (1975) also believes that the significance of verbal behaviour has been largely overlooked in the literature. He commented that it is as though political language was of no significance in itself and its nature is irrelevant for understanding what is being said. He noted, however, that if political language and procedures are of little importance politically, it is surprising how strongly they are valued and insisted upon by the participants in many societies. The one factor that stands out in the literature is the importance and value put on languages and political procedures by various societies. From a comparison of various South Pacific cultures, Bloch found a striking recurrence of very similar patterns of speech norms for politics amongst the different cultures. This similarity is striking at all levels. It exists in the correlation between the type of

event and the type of speech thought appropriate. It occurs in the variety of types of speech recognised within a culture, and it even occurs in the words used by different cultures to describe these different types of speech. This repetition of pattern, suggested Bloch, surely means that we are dealing with something of importance, and something which can therefore be explained.

According to Bloch (1975) all leaders use a variety of political language, one of these being formalised language, which he suggests is used as a kind of power. By contrasting an ideal type 'formalised' language with what might be called ideal everyday speech, Bloch suggested that formalised language is an impoverished language; a language where many of the options at all levels are abandoned so that the choice of form, style, words, and syntax is less rich than occurs in ordinary everyday language. He also compared formalised language with Berstein and Henderson's (1969) restricted code, but considered a wider range of linguistic phenomena and drew different sociological conclusions than they did. He also stressed that the contrast between formalised and impoverished speech should not be seen as a dichotomy between two types of speech but as a continuum between two extremes. The degree of formalisation will vary with cultural traditions and type of language, as well as within a culture, since there might be a number of more or less formalised codes to choose from.

According to Bloch (1975), since the formalisation of speech dramatically restricts what can be said, this leads to a specific style of communication: polite, respectful, and formalistic, but from the point of view of the creativity potential of language, impoverished. A secondary result of formalisation is that it becomes typically the language of authority and ritual (Aitchison, 1966; Bloch, 1974). Bloch (1975) also suggested that there are several factors implied by the acceptance of

formalisation. First, an utterance, instead of being potentially followed by an infinity of other utterances, can be followed by only a few. Thus, the first word implies the last word since there is only one predetermined line along which the speaker can proceed (Shegloff, 1972). Second, if the utterance of a speaker predicts what sort of things he or she will say, it also predicts the answer of the other person, so long as this other person is also accepting the formalised code.

Bloch (1975) stated:

> "In formalised speech the features of articulation... have been rendered arthitic and so the possible answers are dramatically reduced... perhaps even to one. It is a way whereby one speaker can coerce the response of another, a form of social control, and a type of communication where rebellion is impossible and only revolution could be feasible." (p.20)

Arora and Laswell (1969) also suggested that public communications provide a multitude of direct clues to the perspectives of political elites and are not isolated from other features of the political process. Acts of public communication affect, and in turn are affected by, private communication, public and private deeds, and events in the physical environment. Thus, the language of public communication, if examined with care and caution, can disclose many fundamental demands, expectations, and perceptions of identity. They also note that the public language of politics, in common with all modes of communication, is a complicated blend of general and particular statements whereby conceptual terms are indispensable in referring to particular individuals, deeds, and physical happenings.

Edelman (1967) also viewed language as a necessary catalyst of politics and explored the public meanings of the acts and gestures of leaders, the settings in which political acts occur, and the language styles and phrases that permeate political discussion and action. He highlighted

the interplay in politics among acts, actors, setting, language, and the masses, and believes that by understanding this interplay, the intervening levels at which politics has consequences can be recognised. Edelman also noted that political language sometimes directly encourages behaviour contrary to the public's interest such as:

> "the chronic repetition of clichés and stale phrases that serve simply to evoke a conditional uncritical response amongst politicians." (p.124)

Similarly Orwell (1954), cited in Edelman (1967), remarked that if the speech a politician

> "... is making is one that he is accustomed to make over and over again, he may be almost unconscious of what he is saying, as one is when one utters the response in a church. This reduced state of consciousness, if not indispensable, is at any rate favourable to political conformity." (p.125)

Edelman (1967) analysed four distinctive language styles which pervade the Governmental process: horatatory, legal, administrative, and bargaining styles. Of particular interest to this present study is horatatory language which is directed at the mass public and conspicuous in appeals to particular audiences for policy support in election campaigns and in legislative debates. It consists formally of premises, inferences, and conclusions, some stated, others implied. Edelman commented that regardless of the specific issues discussed, the use of this language style is accepted as evidence that the public has an important stake and role in political decisions. He used labour policy as an example.

> "In the field of labour policy the contending parties justify the particular form of Government regulations they favour on the grounds that it will accomplish one or more of the following goals: minimise the harmful effects of strikes, especially on innocent third parties; curb unfair tactics; promote peaceful negotiations; safeguard the public interest; and provide minimal economic and social protections for the worker." (p.137)

According to Edelman, while these phrases may seem to be objective definitions of issues, and are discussed as if they were, they are nothing more than emotional appeals for public support. They appeal to everyone's sense of fairness while concealing conflicts of interest and intent.

Graber (1976) outlined five major functions of political language. First, there is information dissemination. Politicians continually provide the public with formal and informal reports about their activities and the problems faced by the political units for which they have responsibility or with which they interact. The availability of such information is crucial because, for the most part, people cannot experience the world of politics directly. The bulk of their political knowledge must, therefore, be based on verbal images, and

> "it is these images, conveyed through verbal or non-verbal symbols rather than reality, which turn the wheels of the political world." (p.200)

Second, agenda setting occurs, whereby politicians select certain topics, issues and events for discussion and public attention. Once these become matters of public attention, usually through the mass media, they are likely to become matters of public action as well. This happens, according to Graber, because the combination of linkage to an important person and wide publicity through the mass media lends an aura of importance to situations, events, and people even when trivialities and minor figures are involved. She stated that

> "the ability to control the topics for public discussion at the national level is a prized political asset." (p.202)

A third function of political language is one of interpretation and linkage. Facts and concepts, which have been selected for political attention, are usually placed in some kind of verbal context which affects their meaning and hence their impact. The chance to set this context for an

audience permits politicians to encourage others to view the world from their perspectives and act accordingly. According to Graber (1976, 1981) politicians create distinct perceptual and conceptual worlds and that different realities, referred to as reality creation, can be created from the same situation but enclosing the facts with different meanings. Two important facets of reality creation are control over definitions, and manipulation of expectations through verbal pronouncements. Politicians, for example, may claim that inflation is inevitable or that ten percent unemployment rate is normal so that social problems become expected or accepted without protest.

Graber (1976) also describes three common and effective types of linkages. Conceptual linkages place people or events into familiar conceptual categories, along with other people or events for which positive or negative evaluations exist. Causal linkages identify one or several possible causes as responsible for a particular event. The nature of the alleged cause then determines the appropriate reaction to the event. Finally, analogic linkages are similar to conceptual linkages, but liken the event to previous events which, although substantially different in most respects, present some similarities. Graber comments that the linkages speakers choose to make, explicitly or implicitly, to concepts, causes, or analogies, shape the meaning and impact of their messages.

According to Graber (1976) 'reality sleeves' are created as a result of definitions, attention focusing, and linkages. The 'reality sleeve' acts like a set of blinkers which permits political actors to observe only one part of the perceptual and conceptual stimuli which surround them. It acts as a conceptual straightjacket which tightly encloses and prevents individuals or groups from accepting conflicting perceptions. Graber asserts that it is particularly easy to create 'reality sleeves' in those

areas of politics where the audience lacks direct perceptions, prior knowledge, facilities, or motivations to check new information. This forces the audience to rely completely on secondary messages, often from a single message source as is often the case in matters of foreign policy.

A fourth function of political language involves linkages back to the past and projections to the future. A large part of political talk deals with matters of the past and future. The past presumably produces patterns of evidence of tested experience, while visions of the future are glimpses of anticipated outcomes of current and prospective activities. Graber (1976) suggested that all such projections are subjective and often self-serving, and vary considerably among political elites and at different historical times.

The fifth function of political language involves action stimulation whereby the focus shifts from creating mental images and states with language to directly stimulating action with the use of words. According to Graber (1976) stimulus language may be in the form of direct commands, exhortations, suggestions, laws, or rules. It may involve words as action surrogates whereby words become a substitute for action and bring about changes which otherwise require physical action. Alternatively, it may involve words as symbolic rewards or reassurances such as in the form of a formal investigation, public hearing, or mere promises that problems will be solved. It may also involve mood creation such as hope or fear, national pride, cynicism, or mutual hatred. Graber suggested that mood creation is a crucial aspect of political interaction in public legislative assemblies and bargaining groups. She stated:

> "the achievements of such groups depend heavily on the goodwill or hatred, tension or relaxation, fear or hope prevalent in the psychological climate in which they operate". (p.58)

In conclusion it has been established that political communication is an emerging and substantive field of inquiry. A key area of such inquiry is verbal behaviour and politics. Politics is largely a word game and the skills with which politicians use political discourse often determines their political success. It has been found that verbal commitments by politicians, once they have become widely publicised, are reasonably accurate indicators of later action. The major functions of political language were outlined. These included information dissemination, agenda setting, interpretation and linkage, linkages back to the past and projections to the future, and action stimulation. However, despite its political significance, verbal behaviour has received relatively little attention in political analysis.

Studies of verbal behaviour in a particular political setting, namely legislative assemblies, are reviewed in the next sub-section.

2.2.2 Verbal Behaviour in Legislative Assemblies

Overseas Literature

Studies of verbal behaviour in public legislative assemblies have been comparatively scant. There is considerable literature covering the rules for debating in the assemblies of the world, along with voluminous records of actual public debates. In addition, scholars interested in the legislative fate of particular measures have culled tiny slices of the debating process to illustrate legislative reactions to these measures. However, there has been very little serious general analysis of the debating process and other verbal behaviours in large public assemblies (Graber, 1976).

Graber (1976) defined public assembly as

> "any political gathering whose deliberations are likely to become a matter of current public record" (p.214).

This includes such obviously public bodies as national, state and regional legislative assemblies, as well as international assemblies such as the United Nations. Assemblies vary in their degree of 'publicness' depending on the ease of access to the assembly and the likelihood of mass media coverage. Conversely, the constraints imposed on debate by the public nature of assemblies will vary according to the degree of 'publicness'.

The constraints of publicness and the interactions of the debating participants influence the verbal behaviour which occurs in public assemblies. According to Graber (1976) there are three major influences. First, there is adherence by politicians to accepted political and public norms. They may feel compelled to make themselves appear strong, righteous, and devoted to defending the legitimate interests of their constituents. This makes for a great deal of posturing and works against compromises; genuine bargaining, therefore, is rarely possible in open sessions of public assemblies. The resulting rigidity of positions is enhanced by the adherence of political elites to widely sanctioned morally and legally sound policy principles. Past actions and future plans must be defensible in terms of these principles, and political actors lose face when they yield on matters of principle.

Second, there is the maintenance of a productive interactive climate within public assemblies. Most assemblies are goal orientated with certain tasks to perform within a limited timeframe. Therefore, to accomplish these tasks, despite conflicting interests and personalities among the members, verbal behaviour must be judicious, thereby permitting continuous fruitful collaboration and compromise (Graber, 1976). Thus many of the formal and informal rules of public assemblies are directed towards maintaining a productive interactive climate, such as rules to force relevancy of the

discussion, and rules to determine the order in which various viewpoints may be expressed, with time allotments to majority and opposition positions.

However, according to Graber (1976) the bulk of formal and informal rules are concerned with fostering an atmosphere of decorum, if not friendliness, on the assumption that politeness and formality guard against anger, as it is assumed that anger decreases the willingness of parties to co-operate and seek agreement. As such, most assemblies demand that members must refrain from personal attacks of any kind, so that the form of address is often impersonal and stylized. When opposition is expressed, it is often accompanied by words of respect for the opposed party. Most members are not addressed by name but by position or region of representation, and religious and ethnic slurs are negatively sanctioned. In addition, members ordinarily couch issues in language which is unlikely to anger participants in the debate, and develop accepted ways of disagreeing, which minimise rather than aggravate interpersonal friction.

A third major influence on verbal behaviour in public assemblies is the particular listening audiences. A public speaker often must cope with a number of different audiences, each requiring different verbal attention. The need to consider the variety of audiences may force speakers to compromise on what they say or to speak in vague generalities which offend no one and can be interpreted to mean a variety of advantageous things to different groups (Graber, 1976). In addition, once debate has begun, subsequent speakers must speak within the context of the preceding remarks. They may be precluded from touching upon certain issues because prior speakers have already exhausted the patience of the audience on these topics or have given them a slant which cannot readily be counteracted. Graber also suggested that when speakers have assumed certain roles, those following may feel that they must assume an opposing or totally different

role. In this sense previous verbal output helps to shape future verbal output.

Graber (1976) also noted that the effects of debates on audiences depend on other factors besides the substance and quality of the messages. It matters how, when, where, and by whom arguments are made. The speaker's political status is especially important; other things being equal, messages by party leaders and front benchers carry an extra increment of persuasiveness than do messages from less strategically placed individuals. The timing and sequencing of messages which regulate the flow of debate help to determine the success or failure of the motion under discussion. Hence, politicians prize the opportunity to be able to control debate flow, and they entrust this task to those most highly skilled in the techniques of verbal manoeuvering.

Graber (1976) also outlines some ancillary and less obvious functions of verbal behaviour in public assemblies. There are intra-systemic functions which relate to information dissemination, building loyalties and disloyalties, building a record for future action, and tactical verbal manoeuvres. Furthermore, there are the personal goals or ego functions of individual members. These include: the desire for personal, group, or national ego inflation, the need to let off steam or reduce intra-psychic tensions, personal gratification, and speeches primarily to pay off a political debt or to earn political credit with colleagues. Finally, there are extra-systemic functions which relate to audiences outside the assembly. Here the purpose of the address may include attempts to disseminate information to outsiders, efforts to build up support for certain policies, or endeavours to inspire confidence in the political system.

Strickland (1969) examined the incidence of 'double talk' or vague, ambiguous and meaningless utterances spoken in the United States House of

Representatives during the Rat Control Bill in July 1967. The aim of the bill was to make Federal assistance available to urban governments for rat control programmes. Not only was the bill debated around the same time as urban race riots in Newark and Detroit, but the topic of the bill was itself an invitation to various ambiguities. Strickland found that 'double talk' was employed about four times as often by the opponents of the bill (Republicans or Southern Democrats) than by the proponents (Democrats and Liberal Republicans). In the debate, several rhetorical devices, which either diverted attention from or extended the scope of the issue at hand, or which raised the emotional level of the debate so that the speakers would have difficulty thinking clearly, were identified. Strickland suggested that a powerful psychological inducement which leads to political 'double talk' is that issues, acts, and personalities, once sufficiently obscured, serve better as objects of projection. Obscurity leads to mystique which in turn excites all kinds of pent-up grievances and wishes, and sets the scene for the discharge of tensions in the form of stereotypes. Strickland also noted that degenerative tendencies such as manipulation and mystification do creep into legislative deliberations but asked the question

> "what happened to the belief on rational and responsible deliberation by democratic assemblies?" (p.344).

In his view any decision making process that involves an assessment of reality and the sharing of information about reality must include a high degree of unambiguous communication.

Richards (1967) examined the opportunities that the British Parliament provided for the discussion of foreign policy. He conducted a detailed analysis of parliamentary debates on foreign affairs in a particular session, namely from October 1962 to August 1963. This session, he commented, is of special interest because of the obvious variations of

opinion within each of the main parties and the changes in political leadership that took place during that year. He noted that since foreign affairs is generally a matter for negotiation rather than legislation, foreign affairs ministers spend less time steering bills through Parliament than do the ministers of other major departments. The results showed that the House of Commons spent a total of about 87 hours, roughly the equivalent of about two and a half weeks of Commons sitting time, discussing foreign affairs, using a wide variety of procedural devices such as Ministerial Statement, Adjournment Motion, Personal Statement, Debate on the Address in Reply, Government motion, and various bills. An analysis of the debates in The House of Lords showed many similarities, with the Lords spending about 51 hours discussing foreign affairs.

Richards (1967) commented that, in general, foreign affairs debates tend to be disappointing, with their subject-matter being so broad that the attention given to problems is uneven. One speech may have little relation to that which preceded it, and a series of disconnected contributions, in his view, scarcely constitutes 'debates' in the ordinary sense of the word. Since the speeches are limited in number and are diverse in both content and attitude, it is rarely possible to sense dominant trends of opinion from what is said.

Lehnen (1969) analysed the floor behaviour of United States senators from a content analysis of the Congressional Record. The Congressional Record is a reliable account of oral proceedings in the Senate and all non-oral material inserted in the record must be labelled accordingly. Lehnen noted that the Senate debate is generally not a direct or immediate exchange of ideas, facts, and arguments in the spirited manner of parry and counter-thrust. Rather, the speeches are usually set, poorly attended, indifferently received, and frequently interrupted. Data were acquired from

a random sample of the 51 issues "debated" before the United States Senate, of the 87th Congress, first session 1967. The ten issues of the sample selected accounted for 57 of the 207 roll call votes, about 28 percent, taken during the session.

The activity associated with floor debate was quantified by a content analysis, with column inches in the Congressional Record being used as a measure. Each time a comment was recorded the name of the speaker was noted, as were the object, attitude toward the object, and length of the remark. The object of the comment was classified as either substantive, or procedural. Furthermore, the attitude of the substantive comment was coded according to one of three categories: generally favourable towards the object, generally unfavourable towards the object, or generally mixed, not ascertainable, neutral.

The results showed that the activity on the floor, and the number of senators speaking on an issue varied directly with the level of controversy associated with roll call voting. Nearly all of the then 94 senators were recorded as saying something substantive, no matter how short. But only one-third spoke the expected one percent or more of the total debate for all ten issues, and only 16 senators spoke for at least two percent of the total debate. Moreover, the 59 most active senators accounted for nearly 90 percent of the total debate or, in other words, about 60 percent of the Senate did nearly all of the talking. Only on one issue did more than half of the Senate rise to speak at one time or another. The median number of senators speaking per issue was between 17 and 18, with a low of two to a high of 69 senators. These results show that senators do not equally avail themselves of the opportunity to speak on the floor; rather the cues, arguments, and exchanges recorded represent the activity of what is often, a small portion of the total membership.

Lehnen (1969) also looked at the unwritten standards or rules which influence a legislator's scope of action. The first rule he discussed was that new members are expected to serve an unobtrusive apprenticeship. He tested the hypothesis that freshmen senators as a group speak less than senators with more seniority and found statistically significant differences did exist between the freshmen and their more senior colleagues. The differences, however, are based on the total amount of speaking time rather than the frequency of each speaker, since the latter measure did not produce significant differences. The second rule involved the specialist and generalist roles of senators. A specialist is defined as a senator who speaks a substantial amount on a small number of topics, whereas a generalist is a senator who speaks on a large number of topics. The results showed that senators largely devoted their time to becoming experts in particular areas at the expense of attaining competence in many areas; 45 specialists were identified compared to 14 generalists and 40 non-talkers.

Lehnen (1969) also touched on some explanations for the extensive speaking by some senators on the floor. He mentioned that it has been argued that the more vocal people in the Senate behaved so in order to gain national prestige with the hope of attaining yet higher office. However, he noted that in his study most of the listed generalists never seriously considered becoming candidates for higher office, with the exception of three senators. Lehnen also tested the hypothesis that the higher the seniority of ex-state governors in the Senate, the more active they proved to be in floor debate. Although no statistically significant differences appeared among the sample of senators, Lehnen suggested that there is some evidence to support the hypothesis. An analysis of the mean frequency of speaking for the various categories of ex-governors indicated that this measure does increase with seniority. ' However, the amount of speaking as

measured by the total column inches did not agree with the hypothesis. Lehnen stated that:

> "to summarise the findings on the impact of previous training and experience, it is safe to say that these effects, if at all relevant to Senate behaviour, are complicated by yet undefined factors and do not exhibit themselves in any straightforward manner." (p.157)

Graber (1969, 1970) analysed the peacemaking potential of the verbal activities which took place in plenary sessions of the United Nations General Assembly between 1953 and 1965. The studies focused on debates about international conflict in the Middle East. This topic was selected because it has been of substantial direct or collateral interest to most of the United Nations members and elicited plentiful participation from almost the entire membership. The period under study included periods of acute hostilities, such as the Suez war in 1956, as well as periods of relative quiescence. These differences in levels of tension and interaction made it possible to study the effects of these variations on verbal interaction. Friedham, Kadane, and Gamble (1970) in a quantitative content analysis of the United Nations 'Seabed' debate also saw advantages in using United Nations records for the study of verbal behaviour in public assemblies. The advantages included the use of a common set of spoken languages and a reasonably common set of symbols, assessibility of source materials to the public and researchers, the comprehensiveness of the debate data, the lack of necessity for some sampling decisions, and the lack of problems resulting from physically missing data.

The findings of the Graber (1969) study were based on content analysis of all speeches relating to conflict in the Middle East over the specified period. Every topic which appeared in the speech was coded once, regardless of repetitions or length. The tone, style, and the conflict resolving potential of a speech were also recorded. A total of 62

substantive categories with 213 subdivisions were necessary to cover all of the topics mentioned in speeches.

Graber (1969) compared the ratio of favourable bloc (i.e. political alignments: East, West, Arab, and Israeli) comments to unfavourable comments to ascertain whether the overall negotiating climate was positive or negative. Looking at the overall ratio, the accent in the debate leaned towards favourable or positive comments, though not as strongly as expected. When the East-West axis was the subject of discussion, there were 164 negative comments compared to 147 positive comments. Nearly three-quarters of the speeches were recorded as mild or neutral. Conversely, when the Arab-Israeli axis was under discussion, there were 330 favourable comments compared to 256 negative comments, with just over half of all comments being recorded as mild or neutral. Over the 13 year span of the study, the majority of comments, about 80 percent, were conflict resolving, thus tending to foster a spirit of reconciliation rather than tending to increase tensions. No country made only conflict creating speeches, and those countries which showed conflict-creating speeches had an even larger record of conflict-resolving speeches.

Speeches were also analysed according to their tone. About 72 percent of all speeches were moderate in tone, 23 percent immoderate, and only four percent extremely immoderate. The percentage of immoderate speeches rose somewhat during periods of crisis, but the preference for moderation, even during the heat of acute conflict, was unmistakeable. No country made only extremely immoderate speeches, and only five countries made three or more of these speeches. Speech tone, as was to be expected, closely paralleled the tendency for conflict creation or resolution. About 95 percent of all moderate speeches were decidedly conflict-resolving

whereas only 44 percent of immoderate speeches contained constructive suggestions for peacemaking.

Graber (1969, 1970) concluded that an overview of conflict images in the Middle East debates revealed that conflict moderating traits predominated over conflict creating traits. Debate was predominantly moderate in tone, stressed positive qualities and solutions, revealed consensus on basic principles, and avoided, at least in part, rigid partisan lines. Judged as a whole the debates seem to reflect a marked desire among all members, regardless of bloc alignments and political differences, to avoid activities that might escalate hostile feelings and actions. In crisis, even more so than in non-crisis, speeches were usually moderate and delegates were more ready to praise than condemn.

Herman (1973) examined Adjournment Debates in the House of Commons over the 1966-67 parliamentary session when the Labour party was in power. According to Herman, Adjournment Debates are a natural and desirable extension of Question and Answer time. The desire for parties for a little more flexibility during this time has led to the greatly increased use of the daily Motion for Adjournment for the purpose of very short debates on specific issues. Usually, only the opening speaker and a minister take part. Herman classified the Adjournment Debates into four general categories: constituency, regional, national, and international. The subject matter or themes also fell into four general categories: policy reversal, financial assistance, Government statement, and widening activities. During the sample period 175 Adjournment Debates were moved: 80 of these by Labour MP's, 91 by Conservatives, three by Liberals, and one by the Plaid Cymru member. Movers of these debates, with one minor exception, were backbench MP's. Nearly 40 percent of the debates focused on constituency problems, about one-third on national issues, nearly 20 percent

had a regional focus, and about eight percent focused on international matters.

Differences between the two major parties, Labour and Conservative, were few and insignificant. Conservative MP's focused more on challenging previous policies than Labour MP's, 33 percent compared to 16 percent respectively. Both parties focused on the category of 'financial assistance', about 20 percent of the time in each case. Labour MP's concentrated on the categories of 'Government statements', and 'widening activities' nearly one-third of the time, compared to the Conservative's 23 percent. Whereas the Opposition used Adjournment Debates to challenge Government policy at a national level, the Government used them to challenge specific applications of such policies at the constituency level.

Herman (1973) also looked at the number of Adjournment Debates which focused on the various Ministries or Departments. A ranking of the general importance of these Ministries or Departments was also obtained from the rankings of Ministers in each Hansard volume. The rank order association between the number of Adjournment Debates directed at a particular Ministry or Department and the importance of that Ministry or Department produced a weak negative relationship. Herman commented that while this was not statistically significant, the general direction of the relationship was interesting. For example, an impressionistic survey of the House's debates in general suggested that the more important a Ministry or Department, the more the House focused on it. Adjournment Debates, however, in general, reversed this trend, concentrating on the activities of the less important Ministries or Departments. Viewed in this light, Adjournment Debates act as a counterbalance to the House's tendency to deal primarily with matters of major importance and as a potential check on those Ministries or Departments which attract little attention in the House.

In conclusion, although there are only a small number of overseas studies on verbal behaviour in legislative assemblies, such studies contribute greatly to our understanding of this empirically neglected area. The New Zealand literature on this subject, although also scant, is reviewed below.

New Zealand Literature

Horn, Leniston, and Lewis (1983) commented that despite the reliability of Hansard, statements made in the New Zealand Parliament are an under-utilised resource. They stated that

> "... judging from the available scholarship using Hansard as a resource, the words inscribed in Hansard might as well appear in invisible writing" (p.265).

They also noted that content analysis has been used sparingly in New Zealand political inquiry. Some such studies are briefly mentioned below.

Levine (1975), using content analysis, examined the 1972 election manifestos of five New Zealand political parties in order to uncover their underlying value preferences or commitments. Wilson (1983) analysed seven women parliamentarians from a psychological perspective, drawing on studies of political men and women which have been undertaken overseas. The data was gathered primarily by interview, with supplementary information taken from biographical notes and newspaper articles. Discussion on the backgrounds, values, styles, political goals, qualifications, roles, perceptions, and personality traits of these women suggested similarities to politicians in other studies. However, Wilson found that six of the women shared characteristics sufficiently distinctive to warrant introduction of a new category of politician - the 'professional', characterised by similarities such as: age of entry into Parliament (40 years and under), educational qualifications (university degree), occupational background (professional), political style (eclectic, with ideological affirmation),

political orientation (very active, with a high sense of political efficacy and dedication, and a strong sense of individuality and personal standards), political goals (high personal achievement, and the desire to serve community needs and articulate needs of the community), and women's rights (provide role models, have an active interest in women's rights, and articulate the needs of women) (p.227).

Horn et al. (1983) commented that while studies of women in New Zealand politics have become more frequent in recent years, research focusing exclusively on women MP's, apart from pre- and post-election journalistic commentary, has been relatively uncommon. They examined, by content analysis, the changing attitudes, interests, and values of New Zealand women MP's, from the 1930's onwards, as articulated in their Maiden Speeches. Amongst other findings, they found that the major themes of the speeches of these 20 women MP's were: the electorate, women, and the MP's own political party. The Maori women MP's articulated broader ethnic needs and objectives. Overall, National women MP's reflected a more conservative, individualist view consistent with the party's traditional philosophy, whereas Labour women MP's put more emphasis on the equitable distribution of the nation's resources, reflecting a more egalitarian position. One of the most common issues articulated for the 1980's by the three Labour women MP's (Helen Clark, Margaret Shields, and Fran Wilde) was unemployment, whereas the sole woman National MP (Ruth Richardson) made no reference to this issue. However, Ruth Richardson did argue for the Government to remove its supplementary minimum prices programme for farmers so as to remove their link with reliance upon welfare subsidies.

Palmer (1987) estimated the number of working hours of backbenchers when Parliament is in session on the basis of interviews with MP's in 1978. Out of a total of 55 hours minimum working hours per week, MP's spent about

22 hours, or 40 percent of their time, either in the debating chamber or available for divisions. He emphasised that the times presented are minimal and the workload was, by 1987, much heavier than it had been.

As an insight into the pattern of work in the debating chamber, Palmer (1987) examined the number of pages in Hansard devoted to one of several categories. This was done at ten-year intervals starting in the 1956-57 session. The average percentage of space for each category over the 30-year period was legislation (about 39 percent), general Government policy (26 percent), questions and answers (about 15 percent), expenditure (nine percent), private members bills (about four percent), notices of motion (three percent), reports of select committees (about three percent), and miscellaneous (about two percent). As a comparison, for the 1986 parliamentary session legislation accounted for 49 percent of the Hansard space, followed by general Government policy (about 19 percent), questions and answers (about 13 percent), expenditure (about nine percent), private members bills (five percent), miscellaneous (about three percent), reports of select committees (about two percent), and no recorded space for notices of motion.

The four New Zealand studies reviewed shed light on a number of important areas in relation to verbal behaviour in the House of Representatives. These included: the underlying value preferences or commitments of various political parties, an analysis of women parliamentarians from a psychological perspective, an analysis of women MP's as articulated in their Maiden speeches, and a quantitative insight into the pattern of work in the debating chamber.

2.3 SUMMARY

In relation to industrial relations and the news media, a reasonably clear picture emerges as to how industrial relations is portrayed as news. Sufficiently large amounts of industrial relations news reach the general public daily for such information to be regarded as an important factor in the shaping of public consciousness in this area. The news media present a very selective picture of what is happening in industrial relations. The bulk of industrial relations news is directed at instances of industrial action or conflict, with employees and their representatives being presented as the responsible and active agent of such action. By comparison, employers and their associations rarely appear in an industrial relations context. Furthermore, there appear to be clear differences in the way the various parties to industrial relations are described by the media. Negative characteristics are applied more frequently to employees and their representatives than to employers and their associations.

The review of the literature in the industrial relations and news media area also revealed two interesting and invaluable content analysis studies (Hartmann, 1976; Cordery, 1978) which formed the basis for the industrial relations categories and sub-categories used in this present study.

The literature on political communication presents a less clear picture of how politicians portray industrial relations in legislative assemblies. Although, in general terms, the literature proved to be extremely beneficial in terms of understanding the verbal behaviour of politicians in legislative assemblies, there were no studies which focused directly on industrial relations.

However, small facets of information on industrial relations, either directly or indirectly, were able to be gleaned from a few of the studies such as Edelman (1967) and Horn et al. (1983). In addition, although some

of the studies focused on specific subject areas such as foreign affairs (Richards, 1967) and conflict resolving behaviour (Graber, 1969, 1970, 1976), the results of such studies can, indirectly, be applied to the industrial relations area. Furthermore, parts of the methodologies used in some of the studies, such as Lehnen (1969), Graber (1969, 1970, 1976) and Herman (1973) were applied to this present study.

CHAPTER THREE

RATIONALE

The preceding review of the literature showed that there is a small but substantive amount of theoretical and empirical research in both the areas of industrial relations and the news media, and the verbal behaviour of politicians. To the author's knowledge, however, there is no empirical research on how politicians in public legislative assemblies portray matters of an industrial relations nature. However, the empirical research in the above-mentioned areas, combined with some of the theoretical explanations, gives us some idea as to how politicians might portray such matters. We know, for example, that the Government is a prime source of information for the news media on a whole range of issues, including industrial relations, and that politicians frequently engage in 'news management'. We also know that in New Zealand, the Government has a high degree of involvement in industrial relations. Furthermore, one of the functions of Parliament, previously outlined, is to serve as a forum for party political contest and views which inevitably includes industrial relations.

With the above sort of information we might, on the one hand, expect that industrial relations statements made by MP's in Parliament would mirror to some degree the news media's portrayal of such matters. On the other hand, there may, for a variety of reasons, be no concurrence on such matters. The proceeding chapters will attempt to shed some light on this empirically neglected area.

However, before moving on to the next chapter, the author would like to familiarise the reader with the background to, and the day-to-day operations of, the New Zealand House of Representatives. This will acquaint

the reader not only with its form, functions and procedures but also with some of the terminology used in the proceeding chapters. Such an explanation also serves to put the New Zealand Parliament within an international, cultural, historical, and social context.

3.1 NEW ZEALAND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; FORM, FUNCTIONS, AND PROCEDURES

Form

A feature of New Zealand's constitution is that, although it is a monarchy in form, it operates democratically because of a long political tradition of parliamentary Government and a network of constitutional principles (Jackson, 1987). According to Jackson the foundation of any system of Government is its constitution or fundamental laws. In New Zealand the constitution is not contained in a single document that can be referred to as the Constitution. However, New Zealand has had four written constitutions during the course of its history (1817, 1846, 1852), with the most recent being the Constitution Act (1986).

Legally, Parliament is a bi-partite body consisting of the Sovereign in Right of New Zealand, normally represented by the Governor General, and an elected House of Representatives, elected under the provisions of the Electoral Act (1956) (Marshall, 1978; New Zealand Official Year Book, 1987; Palmer, 1987). According to Jackson (1987) the New Zealand House of Representatives is not just another British parliament. He commented that if it is based upon the Westminster model, and has many similarities to its source, there are equally, and arguably, differences which are more significant. Jackson stated:

> "The difference in size, the single chamber, a three instead of a five year term, a different system of legislative committees, and a tightly knit party system with heavy emphasis upon party discipline represent merely the tip of the iceberg as far as differences are concerned." (p.16)

Today the New Zealand parliamentary system revolves around the two-party system. In recent times, however, members of a third party have been elected to Parliament. Furthermore, from time to time members have left one of the parties and have continued to sit as independent members. According to Palmer (1987) since the party system pervades New Zealand politics and Government, much time is spent in party political attack and defence. He stated:

> "...we have a combative, adversary style of politics in which neither side gives any quarter and much effort is wasted in perpetual conflict and constant election-eering.... Much of the so-called debate is sterile and acrimonious, and encourages posturing and the peddling of distorted half-truths." (p.16)

Jackson (1988) commented that if the parliamentary system is meant to be about discussion and compromise, then in a predominantly two-party system like New Zealand, compromise is too frequently viewed as a sign of weakness. He also noted that the floor of the House is seldom the arena for great debates on the nation's affairs and that pressure groups are as likely to have as much influence as an opposition party. Robinson (1969) ascertained that the two-party system has encouraged the development of a highly disciplined party system since cohesion is necessary to obtain and maintain a majority. At stake is the control of power and the control of the Government after the next election.

According to Jackson (1987) the broad characteristics of the New Zealand Parliament are that it is small, even in relation to a small population, and the ratio of MP's to total population is generally lower than in comparable countries. It has a shorter than average term, sitting

for fewer days but longer hours than most. The output of legislation is relatively high, while the number of MP's in relation to parliamentary committees is markedly low. In addition, in comparison with other countries, the MP's themselves are well treated in respect of salaries and allowances.

Functions

Several writers, both overseas and in New Zealand, have attempted to list the functions of Parliament (Cotta, 1974; Crick, 1968; Jackson, 1987; Packenham, 1970; Palmer, 1987; and Skene, 1985). However, over the centuries the role of Parliament has changed; its original purpose has been eroded, and subsequent functions have flourished and waned (Jackson, 1988). Thus, it is easy to think of times when some functions apply but equally easy to think of exceptions. A recent view on the functions of Parliament is put forward by Palmer (1987). He suggested five functions: to raise the money by which the Government may be conducted and to approve the expenditure of money, to consider and pass bills into law, to provide a place for airing grievances, to act as a check on the manner in which Government is actually carried out, and to serve as a forum for the party political contest (p.96).

It is interesting to note that Palmer (1987) placed less emphasis on the communication role of Parliament when compared with Crick (1978), cited in Jackson (1987), who said that parliaments are to be seen as "political communication systems linking Governments and electorates" (p.40). Jackson (1987) also challenged the communication role of Parliament and stated:

> "... if Parliament is meant to be about communication and openness, how is it that as the power of the parliamentary majority has increased, the focus has moved from the floor of the House to the strictly controlled secrecy of a private majority in the caucus room." (p.40).

According to Jackson, the real communication system is the media, and the information role of Parliament is more for what it symbolises - the principle of access to information - than for the information imparted.

The New Zealand Parliament has been placed in the Majoritarian category of legislatures (Cotta, 1974; Jackson, 1987; Lijphart, 1984). Cotta (1974), cited in Jackson (1988), describes this as a two-party or limited multi-party system with a strong party cohesion, a high level of partisanship, limited majorities, a fairly high degree of functional centralisation together with majoritarian decision making and a relatively low level of staffing.

Jackson (1987) regarded the critical factors in a predominantly two-party system as being the size of each party, and the level of internal party cohesion. Legislatures throughout the world range in size from the 2,878 members of the National People's Congress of China to the 13 members of the House of Parliament in Tuvalu (Jackson, 1987). The form of proceedings and opportunities for speaking in the larger assemblies clearly differs from that of the smaller ones, and New Zealand with its single chamber must be in this latter category. The relative size of the majority party also has important effects upon the level of parliamentary discipline and cohesion. Jackson stated:

> "Paradoxically, where there is an overwhelming majority it is much more difficult to keep parties in line. A small majority usually, but not always, has the effect of solidifying party activity." (p.3)

Procedures

This section will briefly summarise some of the major procedures carried out in the New Zealand House of Representatives. For a more comprehensive guide McGee (1985) and the Standing Orders of the House of Representatives (1986) cover the whole range of procedures, regulations, and rules.

In the Standing Orders (1986) there are 413 standing orders relating to all aspects of parliamentary procedure. More specifically, Part 24 contains 56 orders pertaining to the rules of debate in areas such as order, manner and right of speech, statements, interruption of debate, adjournment of debate, limitations on speaking and moving amendments, time limit of speeches, closure of debate, and powers of chair to enforce order. In addition to these standing orders there are specific time limits on speeches, which range from no limit in speeches such as Financial Statement or Address in Reply by the Leader of the Opposition and the Prime Minister, to whole debates of two hours, to 30 minutes for Address in Reply (Mover or Seconder), to five minutes for members presenting petitions. Extension of the time limit of speech is not to exceed half of the original period allowed understanding orders. It is the task of the Speaker of the House to ensure orderly proceedings and that the rules of procedure are followed.

Proposed laws are placed before the House in the form of draft laws known as bills. These bills can be divided into three categories. First, there are public bills which can be split into Government and Private Members' bills. The former bills are usually introduced to the House through a motion by a Minister, whereas the latter bills are usually introduced by a Government backbencher or by a member of the Opposition. Second, local bills are promoted by local authorities to give themselves special powers. Third, private bills are designed to secure powers additional to those granted by general legislation.

The general procedure for passing a bill in Parliament begins with a first reading following its introduction. First reading debates are supposed to concentrate on the purpose of the proposed legislation. Almost all bills are then sent to a Select Committee for detailed scrutiny and for public submission. Following its deliberations the Select Committee will

report the bill back to the House with any proposed amendments. On the second reading of the bill, debate will focus on the substance or principles of the bill. Once read for a second time the bill is ordered to be committed to a Committee of the whole House or, alternatively, referred again to a Select Committee for detailed clause-by-clause scrutiny. Once fully considered the bill is then reported by the chairperson, with or without amendment, to the House. When the report on a bill is adopted, the bill is set down for a third reading on the next sitting day of Parliament. The third reading debate represents the final opportunity for debate to take place on the bill. Once read a third time the bill is then forwarded to the Governor General by the Clerk of the House, and on receiving the Royal Assent the bill becomes an Act and part of the law of New Zealand. It should be noted that the various stages of the bill are subject to slight modification, particularly those referred to Select Committees. In addition, the stages do not always follow any set time pattern with weeks or even months elapsing between readings.

Unless otherwise ordered, the sitting days of the House are Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday between the hours of 2 pm to 5.30 pm and 7.30 pm to 10.30 pm. The Order of Business of the House is the same for Tuesday and Thursday but somewhat different on a Wednesday when a two hour General Debate is held.

While the content of a Government's legislative programme will alter from one session to another, the general pattern of formal parliamentary work is consistent from year to year. The session opens with the Speech from the Throne followed by the Address in Reply Debate. Later in the session wide-ranging debate occurs during the Budget Debate (usually June or July), and this is accompanied by the Imprest Supply Bill and the Appropriation Bill. In addition to the regular opportunities for debate,

the Government of the day, from time to time, moves the Adjournment Debate in order to discuss a major field of policy (Marshall, 1978).

The daily programme for Parliament is determined by the printed order paper which comes out every day that Parliament is in session. The Speaker of the House determines what position the various items for debate take on the order paper, and these must be disposed of in the order in which they appear (Palmer, 1987).

Whereas the Leader of the House determines the agenda for the business of the House, the Opposition determines how long the debate will last on each item. In New Zealand the Opposition is free to debate matters down to the closure which is a motion "that the question be now put". The Speaker has the discretion whether to accept or reject such a motion which is only accepted after considerable debate or where the debate has become tedious and repetitious with no new arguments being advanced (Palmer, 1987). Palmer stated:

> "This procedure provides a balance between the interests of the Government in getting its business through, and the rights of the minority in registering strong resistance to a particular measure." (p.110)

This chapter has outlined a rationale or statement of reasons for carrying out the present study. The New Zealand House of Representatives was also discussed within an international, cultural, historical, and social context. Its form, functions, and procedures were also discussed. It is apparent that the New Zealand Parliament revolves around party politics which involve a tightly-knit party system and a strong emphasis on party discipline and cohesion. It appears that the communication role of Parliament has diminished over the years and that the real communication system, by which information is conveyed to the public, is through the media.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHOD

This chapter outlines the methodology adopted for the investigation and is separated into two major parts. The first part deals with the various sampling issues encountered in the study and is divided into five sub-sections. These include: medium and source document, Hansard sample, sample period, within sample, and item selection.

The second part deals with the actual analysis of the material selected. This is divided into eleven sub-sections, namely: content analysis, amount of coverage, subject matter, causes and effects, negotiation statements, the object, attitude,and tone of comments, moderate tone according to political party and politician, the frequency of items for each politician, participants (including those quoted and the way they are characterised), and debating information. Next, the importance of reliability is discussed, and the various tests for reliability used in this study are outlined. Finally, a short description of the pilot study, along with the various adaptations made for this present study, is given.

4.1 SAMPLING ISSUES

Medium and Source Document

There are several media by which political elites can communicate to the public or audiences. These include television and radio appearances or commentaries, speeches to specific audiences, press releases, constituency newsletters and clinics, personal letters to constituents, and verbal utterances in public assemblies such as Parliament.

For the purpose of this study the communication medium selected was Parliamentary debates. Chapter Two showed that the utterances of influential persons receive wide attention and acceptance due to the source's official status and its power to act or secure compliance in accordance with its pronouncements. Insofar as the members of public assemblies, such as Parliament, are powerful members of political elites, capable of enforcing their views, what they say becomes significant. Since these aspects of verbal behaviour in public assemblies have already been examined in the previous chapter, no further elaboration is needed.

The selection of the source document for this study is Hansard, which is a shorthand expression or title for the official reporting of parliamentary debates in New Zealand and the United Kingdom. The expression 'Hansard' derives from the name of the family responsible for arranging the official reporting of the British Parliament throughout most of the nineteenth century. The term was already widely used at the time official reports commenced in New Zealand, in 1867 (McGee, 1985). Hansard is a report, usually in direct speech, of speeches made in the House, but not necessarily of all the business transacted there. A full record of the business transacted by the House is made by the Clerk for inclusion in the House's Journal. According to McGee (1985), if an item of business does not elicit any debate or words spoken about it, it may not be noted in Hansard at all, as happens with the presentation of some petitions and papers.

McGee (1985) notes that speeches are recorded by shorthand reporters seated at a table in the Chamber beyond the Table of the House. A full tape recording of the proceedings is also made as a back-up to the shorthand report. A typescript of the report is then submitted to each member for correction, usually within two to three hours of the speech being made but sometimes earlier than this. Members are tied to what they have said in the

House and may make only minor grammatical alterations to the report. The meaning or substance of what was said cannot be altered in any way. A corrected daily Hansard is available in print to members about one week after the debate takes place, and the daily reports are combined into publications with a pink cover, referred to as the Hansard 'pinks', for distribution to members, Government bookshops, libraries, and other outlets.

As exceptions to the above procedure, when the House goes into committee, the reporters, although present, do not make a record of speeches except during the Estimates Debate. In this case a summary of each member's speech is published in the third person. In addition, interjections are only reported if the member speaking replies or remarks on them during the course of her or his speech (McGee, 1985).

As well as Hansard there is additional documentation of parliamentary proceedings. There is a Parliamentary Press Gallery. This is immediately above and behind the Speaker's chair and is reserved for the use of accredited members, which include representatives of newspapers, news agencies, radio stations, and television channels, who supply parliamentary news from within Parliament buildings (McGee, 1985).

Proceedings in the House are also broadcast live by Radio New Zealand. Since 1979 the Broadcasting Corporation, and later Radio New Zealand, have been using extracts from the parliamentary sound broadcasts to be used in news and current affairs programmes on radio and television. Radio New Zealand also allows private radio stations to use extracts from the parliamentary broadcasts on payment of copyright (McGee, 1985). Surveys of the listening audience have been carried out. In October 1976 it was found that during the week immediately preceding the survey, some ten percent of the population over ten years of age had tuned in on at least one occasion to parliamentary broadcasts. 'Over the whole sample period about 29

percent of the population listened to the broadcasts. It was estimated that about 41 percent of the population over ten years of age had listened in at one time or another but not necessarily during that year. Furthermore, it was found that the highest proportion of listeners tuned in between 2.30 pm and 4 pm. The actual number of listeners at any one time is something between 5,000 and 25,000 people (McGee, 1985; p.44).

The proceedings of the opening of Parliament are regularly broadcast on television and occasionally other films of the proceedings have been made with the Speaker's permission (McGee, 1985). In Labour's 1984 'Open Government Policy' there was a pledge to televise the proceedings of the House on an experimental basis. This was carried out between the 17 and 19 June 1986 (Palmer, 1987). According to Palmer, feelings amongst members on live television broadcasts were mixed and the Standing Orders Committee, up until 1987, had yet to decide upon the future of such broadcasts.

For the purpose of this study, the term "Parliament" is also synonymous with the terms "House of Representatives" or the "House". Members of Parliament are also, on some occasions, referred to as members or MP's.

In selecting Hansard as the communication source document it became increasingly apparent that it would be difficult to select a contiguous sample of Hansard issues due to day-to-day and seasonal variations in the business of the House. Thus bias could have come from any one of a number of directions such as:

- Daily variations in the business of the House. Although the regular sitting days are Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, business conducted on the latter two days can, on occasions, differ from that on a Tuesday. For example, on Wednesdays, Private Members' Bills are given precedence over Government business whereas on Thursdays Local

Bills are considered to have precedence over Government Bills. Furthermore, for the first six Thursdays of each parliamentary session the orders of the day for Private Members Bills' have precedence over Government Bills.

- The legislative workload is usually heavier at the end of the year or parliamentary sittings so that the House can complete its business before it adjourns.

- Specific but flexible time frames in which some bills or business of the House must be debated, such as expenditure bills and the Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

- Political rhetoric is likely to vary in style and content nearing a general election and depending on the business being debated.

- Industrial relations being subject to seasonal variations such as with the annual wage round which commences about September and goes through to about March of the next year.

- Specific industrial relations legislation which is introduced and debated in Parliament, such as the Labour Relations Bill or the State Sector Bill.

The aim therefore was to select a contiguous sample of Hansard issues, hopefully covering a period of time in which no event on the industrial relations scene or in the business of the House that could be described other than usual would occur. It was felt that the presence of such events might substantially alter the nature of the coverage typically given to industrial relations in the House.

Hansard Sample

Taking into account the above factors it was decided to select a sample covering a full year of parliamentary debates. The first session of the forty-second Parliament (1987-88) was selected. It was felt that since this marks the beginning of a new parliamentary session the political rhetoric is more likely to be representative of a normal parliamentary session rather than one immediately preceding a general election. In addition, since it follows a general election, changes in the membership of Parliament during the sample year were less likely.

It is acknowledged that the rhetoric in the House at the beginning of a parliamentary session, particularly in relation to Maiden or the Address in Reply speech, may not be representative of a normal parliamentary session. Horn, Leniston and Lewis (1983) asserted that

> "... the special character of the Maiden Speech is reflected in the speeches themselves and in the comments that follow them. The speech may be viewed too as an artificial calm before the storm of parliamentary debate commences.... Maiden speeches are traditionally uninterrupted, and are between 30-45 minutes in length (and) represent a source of data offering information about Members' aspirations, goals, motivations, issue concerns and philosophical orientations at the outset of their parliamentary careers". (p.232)

However, it is felt that since the sample covered a full year and because only one Hansard within the sample contained an Address in Reply speech, this would not affect the overall results.

The first month of the forty-second parliamentary session, September, was excluded from the sample because Parliament commenced on the 16 September 1987 and involved only eight sitting days for the remainder of that month. Furthermore, the business of the House during this period consisted of very little by way of legislative matters and focused largely

on the Opening of Parliament, the Swearing in of Members, the Speech from the Throne, and Address in Reply or Maiden speeches.

It was decided that a sample of September Hansard issues in the following year, 1988, would give a better representation of debates and potential industrial relations items for that month.

The month of January (1988) was also excluded from the sample since the House was adjourned over this period. An eleven month period, therefore, from October (1987) to September (1988) was selected for this study.

A stratified random rotational sampling technique was then applied to the sample period. This technique is described in more detail in the next paragraph. Basically it involves dividing the population into subgroups of equal number, then randomly selecting subjects, on a rotational basis, from each sub-group. Because of limitations on the researcher's time (content analysis of this nature is an extremely slow, methodical process) two sample options were considered. The first option was to select randomly on a rotational basis, one sitting day for each month. The second option was to select randomly on a rotational basis, two sitting days for each month, but only for each alternate month (e.g. two days for February, two days for April, two days for June and so on). It was decided to select the latter option for this investigation as this would allow for some continuity and depth within the business of the House for each month. In addition, it was felt that the selection of each alternate month in place of every month, would not unduly affect the results of this investigation.

In this case, therefore, for the month of October (1987) the sitting days of Tuesday and Wednesday were randomly selected. Thereafter, electing each alternate month, and rotating the selected days, December included a Tuesday and a Thursday, March a Wednesday and a Thursday, May a Tuesday and

a Wednesday, July a Tuesday and a Thursday, and September a Wednesday and a Thursday.

Then, out of a pool of the selected sitting days for each elected month, which up to this stage were only generalised, two specific sitting days with dates were randomly selected. This sampling process is shown in more detail in Table 1. Overall this involved a sample of twelve sitting days out of a possible eighty sitting days for the sample period. This amounted to 15 percent of the total sample period and included four Tuesdays, four Wednesdays, and four Thursdays.

It was also decided to elect two bills from the sample period which dealt specifically with matters of an industrial relations nature but were not included in the business of the House for the selected sample sitting days. It was considered these would make useful comparisons with the results of the larger sample. In order to give an accurate picture it was felt that each bill should represent a different stage in its progress through parliament such as introduction, first reading (1R), second reading (2R), or third reading (3R). For this purpose the two bills elected for analysis were: the State Sector Bill, first reading, debated on Tuesday 8 December, 1987; and the Labour Relations Amendment Bill, third reading, debated on 22 March, 1988. These are also presented in Table 1.

Sample Period

There is little point in claiming that the events which occurred during the sample period (October 1987 to September 1988) were a relatively typical run of industrial relations events in this country. Since 1984, with the election of the fourth Labour Government, New Zealand had witnessed sweeping economic changes. Elected for a second term in 1987, the Labour Government was poised to continue with its economic reforms. The sample period is typical, however, of the period in that it was dominated by the

Table 1: Sample of Hansard Issues from October 1987 to September 1988 and Selected Industrial Relations Bills.

Month	Hansard Issues - Day and Dates		
	Tuesday date	Wednesday date	Thursday date
October 1987	6	7	
December 1987[1]	1		3
March 1988[2]		2	3
May 1988	3	4	
July 1988	26		28
September 1988		21	8

1 Also State Sector Bill (1R), Tuesday 8 December.

2 Also Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R), Tuesday, 22 March.

major issues associated with economic reform on a large scale and at a fast pace.

In August 1987 the Labour Relations Act had become law. In October the fourth Labour Government was elected for a second term. Also in October the Council of Trade Unions had its inaugural conference. A few days later New Zealand was feeling the effects of Black Monday - the day of the sharemarket crash. It was during October that the Government announced the proposed closure of over 400 Post Offices. About the same time the Public Service Association (PSA) served 14 days' notice of industrial action on Electricorp. In addition, the meat workers national award talks broke up early. In November the PSA-Electricorp power dispute was escalating with the Government refusing to intervene in the dispute. Proposed restructuring

of the Fire Service was announced, and closure of clothing plants in the South Island appeared imminent.

Then, in December the State Sector Bill was introduced into Parliament. The state sector unions immediately opposed the bill. On the 17 December Roger Douglas announced the ill-fated flat-tax rate package which was deferred in February 1988 by the Prime Minister and subsequently dropped. Also in February opposition to the State Sector Bill was mounting with threats of a national strike by public servants on the 14 March. Meat workers were also proposing to take industrial action over lack of progress in their wage negotiations. In addition, public opposition to the proposed closure of Post Offices was increasing. Unemployment was rising and by then accounted for around eight percent of the total workforce. The second round of public service redundancies was also announced in February, as was the sale of Petrocorp. Nissan New Zealand and the Auckland Engineers Union signed a work flexibility deal, known as the 'Nissan Way', which was heralded as one of the most important industrial agreements of the decade.

In May 1988 the Labour Party's biggest affiliated union, the Service Workers Federation, announced that they would oppose reselection of those MP's who support privatisation of State-Owned Enterprises. In May the restructuring of Telecom was announced. Around this time the Royal Commission on Social Policy's report was released, as was the Picot Report on reform of the education system. In June the 17-week Clyde dam dispute ended. Considerable media attention was also given to the plight of asbestos victims who had previously worked for Fletcher Industries.

In July Telecom announced that it would lay-off 3,000 staff. The closure of more freezing works up and down the country was also proposed. For the approaching wage round it was announced that jobs, not wages, would be the most important negotiation issue. Around this time a 24-hour

national strike by the Harbour Workers Union over a breakdown in award negotiations was proposed. A 3.2 billion dollar budget deficit was also forecast.

Unemployment in August rose to 119,554 with the manufacturing industry being the main source of job loss. Freezing works closed in Dunedin and Christchurch. In addition, there was considerable intra-party arguments within the Labour Party, over the asset sales programme. The tripartite wage talks ended in tatters in early September with no agreement for the wage round due to begin on the 12 September. During this period there was a Cabinet reshuffle and Deputy Minister of Finance, Mike Moore, was given special responsibility to arrive at a compact with the trade union movement. Around this time moves were also underway to dismantle the Waterfront Industries Commission.

Overall, the period from October 1987 to September 1988 was eventful and controversial. It needs to be recognized that the presence of such events, although typical for the period in question, may alter substantially the nature of the attention and content given to industrial relations by politicians in Parliament in this study.

Within Sample

For several reasons it was not considered appropriate or necessary to include all of the business of the House within each sample sitting day. For example, some of the business of the day lacks substantive debate such as some procedural matters and miscellaneous business. Furthermore, 'Questions for Oral Answer' lack the spontaneity of the debating process and further complicate matters in that they are often transferred for written answer. It was also considered inappropriate, for this investigation, to include 'Questions for Written Answer'.

A list of the business of the House was completed during the early stages of the study and items were assessed on whether they should be included in, or excluded from, the study. Generally those items of a substantive debating nature were included and all non-substantive material excluded from the analysis. The business of the House included in, or excluded from, the investigation is presented in Table 2. Within sample material made up nearly three-quarters (71 percent) of the total available sample space.

Item Selection

With the sample of issues and the within subject matter decided upon the actual content to be analysed was then specified. In accordance with the aims of the study it was decided that the analysis would be performed upon items of an industrial relations nature.

After piloting several Hansard issues it became apparent that the definition of industrial relations as used in the Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978) studies was difficult to apply in the parliamentary setting. A more explicit and subtle definition was necessary which took into account external variables such as economic conditions, personalities, and power in society. For this purpose a definition by Geare (1983) was used.

Geare (1983) defined industrial relations

> "as the interaction both among and between the three major parties. External variables such as technology, technological change, market conditions, economic conditions, power in society, personalities, and personality differences become relevant only when they affect the interaction. It is concerned with obtaining, regulating, and adapting the formal and informal rules that govern the work environment for the purpose of enabling the parties to obtain one or more of their principal objectives."

Table 2: Business of the House to be Included in, or Excluded from, the Investigation.

Business to be Included	Business to be Excluded
- Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne	- Business of the House (non-debate)
- Address in Reply, other than to the Speech from the Throne	- In-Committee
- Adjournment Motion (Urgent debate)	- Instruction to Committee
- Amendment motion	- Petitions (non-debate)
- Business of the House (debate; procedure; urgency; weekly statement)	- Prayers
- Consideration of Papers	- Personal Explanation (non-debate)
- Debate General	- Miscellaneous Business (non-debate; announcement of messages from the Governor-General; Swearing in of Members; motions ordering strangers to withdraw; speaker's ruling)
- Debate Declined (Urgent Public Matter)	- Misrepresentation (non-debate)
- Expenditure Debates	- Obituary
- Miscellaneous Business (debate)	- Oral Questions transferred for written answer
- Misrepresentation (debate)	- Questions for oral answer
- Personal explanation (debate)	- Questions on Notice
- Privilege Debate	- Questions for written answer
- Petition Report (debate)	- Speaker's Ruling (replies to questions for written answer)
- Public Bills	- Speech from the Throne
- Private Bills	
- Point of order (procedure; statement; answers to written questions; ministerial statement)	
- Presentation of Petitions (debate)	
- Speaker's Statement (Division Bell)	
- Speaker's Ruling (Presentation of Reports)	
- Reports of Select Committees (debate)	
- Urgent Question(s)	
- Visitor	

> "... the three major parties are: workers and their organisations; managers, employers, and their organisations; and the Government as a legislative body and its agencies. The principal objectives that the parties are trying to obtain are: to improve or at least maintain labour related productivity; to improve or at least maintain personal satisfaction with the factors that make up the job; and to increase or at least retain existing power within the work environment." (p.10).

For an item to qualify for inclusion the above criteria, or parts thereof, must have formed an explicit and substantive part of its subject matter. Substantive criteria was quantified, as in the Cordery (1978) study, to mean 50 percent or more of the item's subject matter. In accordance with the aims of the study, all items concerning events taking place outside New Zealand were excluded except where they might directly influence matters in New Zealand such as a shipping or airline dispute. Although no length criterion was employed all items consisted of at least one sentence or more.

The selection process produced a total of 563 items with industrial relations content for analysis. In addition the State Sector Bill (1R) and the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) produced 86 items and 37 items respectively. A coding schedule, described in the next section, was then completed for each item.

Essentially, the study looks at the contest between the two major parties, Labour and National, since no items were recorded for the Social Democratic Party. Thus, the term Opposition used within the context of this study, unless otherwise stated, refers to National Members of Parliament.

4.2 ANALYSIS

The form of content analysis used was similar to that used by Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978). However, some additions and alterations

to the basic design were necessary in order to provide a fuller analysis. Furthermore, following a full examination of the literature (Graber, 1969, 1970; Herman, 1972; Lehnen, 1969; Richards, 1967) other variables were introduced into the study.

Content Analysis

According to Babbie (1979), Berelson (1954, 1971), and others, content analysis is a particularly well suited research technique for the study of communications and to answering the classic questions of communications research put forward by Lasswell, Lerner, and Pool (1952) and Holsti (1969): "who says what, to whom, how, and with what effect, and why?" In its simplest form content analysis refers to the coding or classification of the information under investigation in terms of some conceptual framework (Babbie, 1979). So diverse are the various sampling and coding techniques of content analysis that any general review of these different techniques would serve little purpose here. However, the reader is referred to Holsti (1969) and Babbie (1979) for such reviews.

This investigation uses both a quantitative and qualitative approach to content analysis, termed the 'hard' and 'soft' approaches by Frank (1973), cited in Cordery (1978). According to Cordery the 'hard' approach typically utilises relatively objective frequency counts of what are considered to be discrete and quantifiable elements of the communication. For example, the amount of industrial relations subject matter, in column inches, found in each Hansard issue. The major advantage of this approach is that concreteness of the materials studied strengthens the likelihood of reliability. Furthermore, the intrusion of individual bias into the analysis is arguably less than is the case with qualitative analyses.

There are, however, many aspects of a communication that cannot be studied using the 'hard' approach and another approach which can evaluate

the underlying meaning of communication is required. To this end the 'soft' or qualitative method is used. Here, the communication material is evaluated according to a number of stated dimensions or variables. For example, the tone of a speech may be considered as either conflict creating, conflict moderating, or generally mixed, not ascertainable, or neutral. Clearly this second approach would appear better designed for tapping the underlying meaning of communication, but this advantage may come at the cost of reliability and specificity. A speech that may be regarded as conflict creating by one coder may seem conflict moderating or neutral to another.

Obviously the best solution to the above dilemma is to adopt a more comprehensive approach and to utilise both the 'soft' and 'hard' approach. Therefore, for this investigation both methods were used, with tests for reliability being discussed elsewhere in this chapter. It should also be noted that even using both approaches, content analysis on its own cannot answer questions about the effects of the communications being analysed nor about factors underlying its production and the intentions of the speaker. It may provide strong inferences about these things but such inferences need to be checked by other means (Hartmann, 1976).

Amount of Coverage

This part of the study was aimed at examining the amount of industrial relations language appearing in each Hansard or elected sample bill. The total amount of space available in each Hansard or bill was measured as well as within sample space and the amount of space given to each industrial relations item. Data were collected in the form of column centimetres. The same ruler was used for the entire study since it was discovered early in the investigation that because the measurements required were so precise the use of different rulers resulted in slight variations of measurement.

The amount of industrial relations space for each sample month, parliamentary sitting day, political party, and politician were also recorded.

Subject Matter

Items were then coded according to their main category of subject matter or theme. This was a process aimed at determining the type of industrial relations subject matter typically addressed by politicians in Parliament. A pilot study, discussed in more detail in the final sub-section of this chapter, was undertaken to check if the subject matter categories used in the Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978) studies were suitable for this investigation. Overall, the ten industrial relations categories used in both studies were found to adequately cover the range of subjects debated in Parliament. However, some adaptations to the categories were necessary. These are outlined in more detail in the final sub-section. The industrial relations categories, with appropriate descriptions, used in this present study are shown in Table 3. The coding of items within each of the ten categories was generally a straightforward exercise. However, where difficulty did occur, the item was carefully examined in relation to the main event or concept being focused on by the speaker.

The pilot study also checked the suitability of the various sub-categories used by Cordery (1978) in order to give a fuller description of the major subject matter categories. As with the major categories, the sub-categories provided an excellent foundation, although adaptations and extensions were necessary for this investigation. These are outlined in more detail in the final sub-section. The sub-categories used in this present study are shown in Table 4.

Table 3: Industrial Relations Categories*

Category	Description
1. Industrial Action.	Items about employee-employer and collective-individual forms of industrial action such as strikes, lockouts, stopwork meetings, work to rule, go slow, the ban, labour turnover, industrial accidents and sabotage. Includes past and impending action.
2. Negotiations, Mediation, Conciliation, Arbitration, Communication.	Items on negotiations of awards and agreements, tripartite wage conference, wage bargaining, and all negotiations over industrial matters. Includes items on industrial democracy. Excludes items where industrial action is taking place or being planned.
3. Economic Context.	Items on the cost of living, balance of payments, unemployment and general economics in which industrial relations form an explicit and substantive part. Excludes those items dealing with specific instances of industrial action and negotiation.
4. Political Action/ Statements/Views.	Items on the actions, statements, and views of Government, politicians, and party representatives in which industrial relations form an explicit and substantive part, excluding those to do with specific instances of industrial action and negotiation.
5. State Agencies.	Items on the actions and statements of state agencies involved in industrial relations matters (e.g. Ombudsman, Human Rights Commission, Tribunals). Includes proposed agencies. Excludes those items dealing with specific instances of industrial action and negotiation.
6. Union-Employee Actions/ Statements/Views.	Items on the actions, statements, and views of the Trade Union Movement, Trade Unions, and their officials. Includes individual employees who are not necessary members of a union. Excludes items to do with industrial action or negotiation.

Table 3 ctd....

Category	Description
7. Employers-Manager Action/ Statements/Views.	Item on the actions, statements, and views of employer associations, employers, company directors, and managers, other than those to do with industrial action or negotiation.
8. Work and Conditions.	Items on the nature and conditions of work, work performance, procedures, rules, and regulations, job satisfaction, and personnel management (e.g. planning, job analysis, recruitment, job selection and placement, job evaluation and appraisal, motivation, compensation, training and development), in which industrial relations form an explicit and substantive part. Excludes items to do with industrial action or negotiation.
9. Industrial Developments.	Items on restructuring, redundancies, mergers, technology and technological changes in which industrial relations form an explicit and substantive part. Excludes items to do with industrial action or negotiation.
10. Others.	All items that do not fit into the other categories.

*Adapted from Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978).

Table 4: Industrial Relations Sub-Categories

Category		Sub-Category	
1.	Industrial Action.		
1.1	Initiator	a.	Union-employee initiated.
		b.	Employer-manager initiated.
		c.	Mixture of a and b.
		d.	Not ascertainable.
		e.	Other.
1.2	Location.	a.	Local.
		b.	Regional.
		c.	National.
		d.	Amalgam of a, b, and c.
		e.	Not ascertainable.
1.3	Type of Action.	a.	Strike.
		b.	Mass resignation.
		c.	Go slow.
		d.	The ban (overtime, load-out, black).
		e.	Lockout.
		f.	Mass notice of dismissal.
		g.	Return to work.
		h.	Industrial action in general.
		i.	Negotiations/statements over past action.
		j.	Negotiations/statements over ongoing action.
		k.	Negotiations/statements about impending action.
		l.	Other.
2.	Negotiations, Mediation, Conciliation, Arbitration, Communication.		
2.1	Types of Negotiations covered.	a.	Union-Employer/Management.
		b.	Union-Government.
		c.	Employer/Management-Government.
		d.	Union-Union.
		e.	Employer/Management-Employer/ Management.
		f.	Union-Employer/Management-Government.
		g.	Other.
2.2	Topic of Negotiation.	a.	Dispute of interest (i.e. awards and agreements).
		b.	Dispute of rights (i.e. over interpretation of awards and agreements).
		c.	Personal grievance.
		d.	Demarcation dispute.
		e.	Collective agreements.
		f.	Wage and allowance negotiations.

Table 4 ctd...

Category		Sub-Category	
		g.	Items mentioning the collapse of negotiations except where industrial action is being specifically planned.
		h.	Items mentioning favourable progress or successful outcome.
		i.	Items mentioning the unwillingness of parties to agree or negotiate.
		j.	Items mentioning the situation as a stalemate.
		k.	Items dealing with the role of a third party in negotiations.
		l.	Other.
3.	Economic Context	a.	Cost of living, buying power of wages.
		b.	General economic well-being of the country including items on the balance of payments, trade figures, inflation.
		c.	Economic well-being of a private or public company.
		d.	Economic well-being of a State-Owned Enterprise or Government Corporation, or Government Department.
		e.	Economic well-being of a particular sector or group in society.
		f.	Unemployment.
		g.	An amalgam of all the above.
		h.	Other.
4.	Political Action/ Statements/Views.	a.	By the Government.
		b.	By the Opposition.
		c.	By others.
5.	State Agency	a.	Wage determining agency.
		b.	Proposed agencies.
		c.	Others.
6.	Union-Employee Action/ Statements/Views	a.	Federation of Labour, Trade Union movement.
		b.	Unions, Associations, Guilds.
		c.	Individual employees.
		d.	Other.
7.	Employer-Manager Action/ Statements/Views	a.	State-Owned Enterprises, Government Corporations or Government Departments.
		b.	Employers Associations.
		c.	Others.

Table 4 ctd...

Category		Sub-Category	
8.	Work and Conditions	a.	Health and/or safety.
		b.	Hours of work.
		c.	Holidays.
		d.	Work skills and activities.
		e.	Performance-effectiveness employers/ management.
		f.	Performance-effectiveness employee.
		g.	Amalgam of d, e, and f.
		h.	Procedures, rules, regulations, safe-guards, controls.
		i.	Job satisfaction, morale.
		j.	Powers and responsibilities.
		k.	Personnel (planning, job analysis, recruitment, job selection and place-ment, job evaluation and appraisal, motivation, compensation, training and development, career development).
		l.	Other conditions.
9.	Industrial Developments.	a.	State-Owned Enterprises, Government Corporations, or Government Depart-ments.
		b.	Other.
10.	Others.		

Causes and Effects

As in the Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978) studies, for all items which were coded under the category of industrial action, a record was kept of any causes and effects mentioned for the action. Whereas in the Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978) studies industrial action accounted for about 42 percent and 30 percent respectively of the total subject matter, in this study only four items relating to industrial action were found.

Causes. Early in the investigation it became apparent that industrial action would feature much less than in the previously mentioned media studies. It was not necessary, therefore, to formulate a list of causal categories as was done in the Cordery (1978) study. However, causes were further coded as elaborated or unelaborated and a record was also kept of those items in which no cause was given.

As in the Cordery (1978) study, for a statement to be classified as a cause it had to propose an actual, as opposed to a hypothetical, causal relationship between the cause and the mentioned industrial action. A record was kept of every such cause along with the identity of the politician making the causal statement. An elaborated cause was defined as one evolving over two or more sentences, while an unelaborated cause was defined as one consisting of a single sentence statement of causality. Those items in which no cause was given for the action were also recorded.

Effects. Similarly, those effects mentioned in an industrial action statement as an actual, rather than a hypothetical, consequence of the action were recorded along with identity of the politician making the statement. A record was kept of those items listing no effects for the mentioned action, and of those items which mentioned neither cause nor

effect. Effects were further coded as 'elaborated' or 'unelaborated' and defined in the same manner as were 'elaborated' or 'unelaborated' causes.

Negotiation Statements

This study assumes that negotiating, conflict resolution, or moderating behaviour is more desirable in the political and industrial relations arenas than behaviour that is conflict creating. Although this inference is based on an assumption that requires further investigation, and may be viewed with an appropriate degree of scepticism, it does find support in various individual and group behaviour studies as well as in studies about the effects of verbal behaviour in bargaining situations.

It was decided, therefore, for all items which were coded under the category of negotiation, to record the identify of the politician making the statement and her or his political party.

Object, Attitude, and Tone of Comment

As in the Lehnen (1969) study each time a member's statement was recorded, the object of the speech, the attitude towards the object, and the tone of the speech were also noted.

The object of the speech was classified as either substantive (i.e. pertaining to the motion or bill) or procedural (e.g. point of order) or interruptive.

The attitude of the speech was coded according to one of three categories: generally favourable towards the object, generally unfavourable towards the object, or generally mixed-not-ascertainable-neutral. In many cases the attitude of a particular statement was difficult to ascertain. In these cases the generalised attitude of the entire paragraph was considered.

Furthermore, as in the Graber (1969) study, the tone of each statement was coded according to one of three categories: conflict creating,

moderating, or generally mixed-not ascertainable-neutral. Where the tone of the comment was difficult to ascertain, the generalised tone of the entire paragraph was considered.

Moderate Tone According to Political Party and Politician

As previously stated, it is assumed that moderating behaviour is a desirable attribute for politicians to have. Therefore, for all those items coded as being moderate the speaker's name and political party was recorded.

Frequency of Items for Each Political Party

For this section the total number of items were recorded as were the number of items for each political party.

Participants

For every item recorded a record was made of the type of participants, groups, or organisations mentioned. A list of participant types was compiled during the early stages of the analysis, and items were coded according to each participant type. A list of participant types is shown in Table 5.

The analysis consisted of counting the frequency with which each participant type appeared in industrial relations items. The data were collected in such a way that each participant type was checked only once for each item. Thus, if two employees, two employers, and two unemployed people were presented in an item, the categories of employees, employers, and unemployed would each be checked only once. Thus, as in the Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978) studies, it is possible to determine how wide a cast of characters are portrayed in industrial relations items and whether the overall coverage focuses on certain participants as opposed to others.

Table 5: List of Participant Types

1.	Boards (e.g. Committees, Trusts - both private and statutory)	19.	Ministers
2.	Cabinet (general)	20.	Members of Parliament (general)
3.	Consultants/Experts	21.	Managers
4.	Employers (general)	22.	Ministerial Committee
5.	Employers (specific)	23.	News media
6.	Employers-employees	24.	National Government
7.	Employers-managers-employees	25.	National Party
8.	Employers-managers	26.	Opposition members
9.	Employees	27.	Public
10.	Employees-managers	28.	Parliament
11.	Employers Associations/ Representatives	29.	Prime Minister
12.	Exporters	30.	State Bodies/Quangos
13.	Government (general)	31.	Select Committees
14.	Government subsidised programmes	32.	Trade Unions/Associations/ Guilds
15.	Government Departments/ State-Owned-Enterprises/ Corporations	33.	Union Officials
16.	Government members	34.	Unemployed
17.	Labour Party	35.	Other
18.	Local Bodies/Officials		

Quotations. This part of the analysis involved recording each time a participant was directly or indirectly quoted.

Characterisation. A record was also kept of the way and frequency with which the various participant types were named or described.

Debating Information

Since one of the aims of the study was to contribute a few observations regarding New Zealand Parliamentary debates, the title and type of debate (i.e., 1st Reading, 2nd Reading, or 3rd Reading) were recorded. Where possible, the mover of the debate and his or her political affiliation was recorded, as was the outcome of the debate.

Reliability

The literature on understanding social science research in general and content analysis specifically stresses the importance of the reliability or consistency of measurement tools. Berelson (1954), cited in Cordery (1978), asserts that two types of category reliability are desirable in content analysis. These are: consistency among coders in assigning items to categories; and consistency through time in assigning items to categories (p.49).

In this investigation tests of reliability were sought in those sections or areas seen as involving the more difficult coding decisions. Limitations of time and resources made it difficult to train other independent coders in all aspects of the study. Therefore, a combination of intercoder reliability and a measure of one coder's consistency over time were used. The technique used for training a separate coder is shown in Appendix 5.

a. Reliability of Within Hansard Material

This part of the analysis was repeated by the same coder after a three month period.

b. Reliability of Subject Matter Coding

Reliability was checked by submitting a random sample of ten percent of the items to a separate coder. Results of the major categories and the sub-categories were then compared. Those items which generated disagreement were evaluated more carefully and the area of disagreement resolved.

c. Reliability of Causes and Effects

Reliability of coding causes and effects for the category of industrial action was assessed by the same coder repeating the exercise after a three month period.

d. Reliability of Coding Object, Attitude, and Tone of Comments

Reliability was assessed by submitting a random sample of ten percent of the items to a separate coder. Those items which generated disagreement were evaluated more carefully and resolved.

e. Reliability of Coding Participant Types

Similarly, reliability was checked by submitting a random sample of ten percent of the items to a separate coder. Where there were areas of disagreement, these were carefully evaluated and resolved.

4.3 PILOT STUDY

In the pilot study two parliamentary sitting days were selected at random for the content analysis. The only conditions for selection were that the two days should fall within the previously elected sample period (October 1987 to September 1988) but not include those sample Hansard issues

also previously selected. Thus, the two days elected were: Wednesday 11 November, 1987 (Hansard Number 6), and Tuesday 14 June, 1988 (Hansard Number 21).

As stated previously, although the industrial relations categories used in the Hartmann (1976) and Cordery (1978) studies, and the sub-categories used in the Cordery (1978) study were found, in general, to adequately cover the range of subjects being debated, some modifications were necessary.

Modifications to the industrial relations categories were only slight. The category of 'negotiation' was extended to include 'mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and communication'. The actions and statements of politicians, union-employees, and employer-managers was also extended to incorporate their 'views'. In the actual descriptions of some of the categories, minor re-wording was necessary in order to define the categories more appropriately and remove any ambiguity. However, in the category of 'work and conditions', some major re-wording was necessary.

Modifications and re-wording of the various sub-categories ranged from slight to major. In the category of 'industrial action', the types of action were extended from eight to twelve sub-categories. In addition, two new aspects were introduced: the initiator, and the location of the industrial action.

In the category of 'negotiations' the topics of negotiation were increased from eight to 12 sub-categories. Some re-wording was necessary in the sub-categories of 'political action and statements'. Another sub-category was introduced to the category of 'state agency', namely 'proposed agencies'. A further sub-category was also added to the category of 'union-employee actions and statements', along with some minor re-wording.

In the category of 'employer-manager actions and statements' the number of sub-categories was extended from nil to three. The category of 'work and conditions' was extended from four to 11 sub-categories. Finally, the number of sub-categories in the category of industrial developments was increased from nil to two.

The pilot study also provided the opportunity to test the other items selected for content analysis such as causes and effects of industrial action, negotiation statements, the object, attitude and tone of comments, and the participants (including those quoted and the way they were characterised).

The key to successfully collecting the data for the content analysis lay in devising a suitable instrument which would incorporate all the information requirements for each sample parliamentary sitting day. Furthermore, that the data be presented in such a way that it was easily retrievable for analysis.

Subsequently a standardised working instrument in the form of a small booklet was developed for each sample Hansard. This contained all the items for analysis, but with each item, or parts thereof, presented on a separate page. A facesheet was also included with each booklet and contained information such as the date and number of the Hansard issue, the total amount of space recorded in column centimetres, as well as the amount of written sample space and industrial relations space. A separate record was also kept, for each sample Hansard issue, of every item of business included in the study.

In conclusion the pilot study provided the opportunity to test, and modify the various items selected for the content analysis. It also provided the opportunity to develop and refine a standardised working instrument that allowed not only for the efficient collection of

information, but also for the information to be easily retrievable for analysis.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

This chapter presents and discusses the main results of the study and is separated into two major parts. The first part focuses on those results relating to the amount of coverage for both the sample Hansard issues and elected sample bills. There are seven sub-sections. The first three look at the total amount of space available in each Hansard, along with the within sample space and amount of space given to industrial relations, the amount of space and industrial relations content available in each elected sample bill, and the amount of industrial relations content for each sample month. The next two sub-sections deal with the amount of industrial relations content for each parliamentary sitting day, and for each political party. These are followed by the amount of industrial content in each elected sample bill according to political party. Finally, the amount of industrial relations content spoken by each politician according to political party is analysed.

The second part deals with the actual subject matter and is divided into nine sub-sections. These include: industrial relations categories, a sub-analysis of the industrial relations categories, causes and effects, negotiations and communications, the object, attitude, and tone of MP's comments, moderating comments, frequency of participant types and quotations, and characterisation of participant types. Finally, information relating to the debates in general is analysed.

5.1 AMOUNT OF COVERAGE

5.1.1 The total amount of space available in each Hansard along with the within sample space (i.e. the business of the House included for analysis), and the amount of space given to items of an industrial relations nature are presented in Table 6. This shows the within sample space expressed as a percentage of the total space for each Hansard and grand total space (i.e. for all the sample Hansard issues). It also shows the industrial relations content expressed as both a percentage of within sample space and total space for each Hansard and grand total.

The grand total within sample space accounted for about 71 percent of the grand total space. The grand total of industrial relations content accounted for about 17 percent of the grand total within sample space, and 12 percent of the grand total space.

The total space recorded in each Hansard ranged from 511.7 c.cm to 4466 c.cm. Similarly, the within sample space ranged from 51.4 c.cm (10 percent) to 1066.1 c.cm (83.9 percent), and the industrial relations space from 7.3 c.cm to 437.6 c.cm.

5.1.2 The amount of space available and the amount of industrial relations content in each elected sample bill are presented in Table 7. This also shows the within sample space (expressed as a percentage of the total space) for each elected bill, and the industrial relations space (expressed as both a percentage of within sample space and total space) for each elected bill.

Table 7 shows that although the total space available in each elected bill varied considerably (a difference of about eight Hansard pages) the within sample space and the amount of industrial relations content for both elected bills was, as expected, very high. As a comparison, the highest amount of industrial relations content, expressed as a percentage of within

Table 6: Total Hansard Space, Within Sample Space, and Amount of Industrial Relations Space in Each Hansard

Year	Day	Date	Total Space (c.cm)	Within Sample Space (c.cm)	% Total	Amount of Industrial Relations (c.cm)	Within %	Total %
1987	Tuesday	6 October	1271.8	1066.1	83.9	172.7	16.2	13.6
	Wednesday	7 October	1226.6	1012.8	82.6	145.4	14.4	11.9
	Tuesday	1 December	723.6	359.2	49.6	112.7	31.4	15.6
	Thursday	3 December	1106.0	895.4	81.0	103.7	11.6	9.4
1988	Wednesday	2 March	1301.8	1079.2	82.9	89.3	8.3	6.9
	Thursday	3 March	1180.6	880.8	74.6	199.2	22.6	16.9
	Tuesday	3 May	781.0	365.2	46.8	96.9	26.5	12.4
	Wednesday	4 May	1267.2	1020.5	80.5	247.9	24.3	19.6
	Tuesday	26 July	2352.3	1965.7	83.6	287.6	14.6	12.2
	Thursday	28 July	4466.0	2768.6	62.0	437.6	15.8	9.8
	Thursday	8 September	511.7	51.4	10.0	7.3	14.2	1.4
	Wednesday	21 September	1598.2	1196.9	74.9	236.8	19.8	14.8
	Grand Total		17786.8	12661.8	71.2	2137.1	16.9	12.0

Table 7: Total Space, Within Sample Space, and Amount of Industrial Relations Space in Each Elected Sample Bill

Year	Day	Date	Bill Title	Total Space (c.cm.)	Within Sample space (c.cm.)	% Total	Amount of Industrial Relations (c.cm.)	Within %
1987	Tuesday	8 December	State Sector Bill (1R)	282.6	274.9	97.3	221.1	80.4
1988	Tuesday	22 March	Labour Relations Amdt. Bill (3R)	124.2	109.2	87.9	95.9	87.8

sample space, recorded for the Hansard sample issues in Table 6 was about 27 percent, compared to about 80 percent and 88 percent for each of the elected bills.

Although the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) had the least total space and within sample space of the two elected bills, it had a slightly higher percentage of industrial content expressed as a percentage of within sample space.

5.1.3 The amount of industrial Relations content for each sample month is shown in Table 8. In October 1987 the amount of industrial relations content recorded was 318 c.cm (the equivalent of about 17 Hansard pages). This dropped considerably to about 216 c.cm in December and then gradually rose in March and May 1988, peaking in July at 725 c.cm but dropping in September to the second lowest recording of 244 c.cm.

Table 8: Amount of Industrial Relations Content for Each Sample Month.

Year	Month	Industrial Relations Content (c.cm)
1987	October	318.1
	December	216.4
1988	March	288.5
	May	344.8
	July	752.2
	September	244.1
	TOTAL	2137.1

5.1.4 The amount of industrial relations content for each parliamentary sitting day, on a weekly basis (i.e. Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday), is presented in Table 9. The total industrial relations content for each of the weekly sitting days does not vary greatly, with Thursdays recording the highest total and Tuesdays the lowest total. Debates held on Thursdays show both the highest and lowest industrial relations content recordings, these being 437 c.cm and 7 c.cm respectively.

Table 9: Amount of Industrial Relations Content for Each Parliamentary Sitting Day.

	Tuesdays (c.cm)	Wednesdays (c.cm)	Thursdays (c.cm)
	172.7	145.4	103.7
	112.7	89.3	199.2
	96.9	247.9	437.6
	287.6	236.8	7.3
TOTAL	669.9	719.4	747.8

5.1.5 Table 10 shows the amount of industrial relations content for each political party and sample month. The National Party (Opposition) recorded the highest industrial content over the sample period, about 57 percent, compared to the Labour Party's (Government) recording of 43 percent. Furthermore, for each of the six sample months the Opposition recorded the highest industrial content. However, in March and July 1988 the recordings between the two parties were relatively close. There were no recordings for the Democratic Party.

Table 10: Amount of Industrial Relations Content for Each Political Party and Sample Month.

Political	October (c.cm.)	December (c.cm.)	March (c.cm)	May (c.cm)	July (c.cm)	September (c.cm)	Total (c.cm)	%
Labour	104.3	80.1	142.3	147.2	355.6	91.7	921.2	43.1
National	213.8	136.3	146.2	197.6	369.6	152.4	1215.9	56.9

5.1.6 The amount of industrial relations content in each elected sample bill, according to political party, is presented in Table 11. In both bills the Opposition recorded the highest industrial relations content. More specifically, in the State Sector Bill (1R) the Opposition accounted for about 63 percent of the total industrial relations content compared to the Government's 37 percent. Furthermore, in the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) the Opposition accounted for 73 percent of the total industrial relations content compared to the Government's 27 percent. There were no recordings for the Democratic Party.

Table 11: Amount of Industrial Relations Content in Each Elected Sample Bill According to Political Party.

Political Party	State Sector Bill (1R) (c.cm)	%	Labour Relations Amdt. Bill (3R) (c.cm)	%
Labour	82.7	37.4	25.9	27.9
National	138.4	62.6	70.0	73.0
TOTAL	221.1		95.9	

5.1.7 The amount of industrial relations content spoken by each politician, (or in some cases, not spoken), according to political party is presented in Table 12. For the benefit of the reader, further information pertaining to the MP's is provided in the appendices. A full list of Members of the House of Representatives and the Ministry for the first session of the forty-second Parliament 1987 is shown in Appendix 1 and 2 respectively. The allocation of National Party spokespersons, announced by the Leader of the Opposition on the 11 September 1987, is shown in Appendix 3. Furthermore, the composition of Parliamentary Select Committees is presented in Appendix 4. The format of this sub-section involves the analysis of each political party according to the sample Hansard issues and each elected sample bill.

Labour Party

(a) Sample Hansard Issues

The average amount of industrial relations content recorded for all Labour MP's was 15.9 c.cm with a median of 8.7 c.cm. Of the twenty-four Ministers, including Associate Ministers, thirteen or about 54 percent had scores above the median, with scores ranging from 140.2 c.cm to 11.3 c.cm. Of the four Parliamentary Under-Secretaries, three scored above the median, with scores ranging from 30.2 c.cm to 9.3 c.cm. The Senior Whip, Margaret Austin, and the Junior Whip, Trevor Mallard, scored below the median.

Taking the top ten recordings, the Minister of Finance, Roger Douglas, accounted for the highest industrial relations content (140.2 c.cm), followed quite a long way behind by Dr William Sutton (97.3 c.cm), then a considerable drop to Philip Goff (64.8 c.cm), followed by Patricia Tennet (49.5 c.cm), David Butcher (44.5 c.cm), David Caygill (41.0 c.cm), James Sutton (40.5 c.cm), Annette King (30.2 c.cm), Trevor de Cleene (25.6 c.cm), and Richard Northey (23.8 c.cm).

Table 12: Amount of Industrial Relations content* Spoken by Each Politician According to Political Party

No.	Labour Party	Hansard Issue sample	State Sector Bill	Labour Relations Amdt Bill	National Party	Hansard Issue sample	State Sector Bill	Labour Relations Amdt Bill
1.	Douglas, Hon. R.D., Manurewa	140.2	-	-	Storey, W.R., Waikato	81.7	-	-
2.	Sutton, Dr W.D., Hawkes Bay	97.3	-	-	Burdon, P.R., Fendalton	74.6	-	-
3.	Goff, Hon, P.B. Roskill	64.8	-	-	Birch, Hon. W.F., Maramarua	68.5	50.9	23.0
4.	Tennet, P.E., Island Bay	49.5	-	-	Kidd, D.L., Marlborough	64.4	-	-
5.	Butcher, Hon. D.J., Hastings	44.5	-	-	Peters, W.R., Tauranga	61.0	-	-
6.	Caygill, Hon. D.F., St Albans	41.0	-	-	Cooper, Hon. W.E., Otago	60.8	-	-
7.	Sutton, J.R., Waitaki	40.5	-	-	Shipley, J.M. Ashburton	59.4	-	-
8.	King, A.F., Horowhenua	30.2	-	-	Marshall, D.W.A., Rangitikei	59.2	-	-
9.	de Cleene, Hon. T.A., Palmerston Nth	25.6	-	-	McLean, I., Tarawera	59.1	21.4	-
10.	Northey, R.J., Eden	23.8	-	-	Bolger, Hon. J.B., King Country	57.4	12.4	-
11.	Prebble, Hon. R.W., Auckland Central	23.0	-	-	Maxwell, R.F.H., Taranaki	55.3	25.8	22.5
12.	Palmer, Rt. Hon. G.W., Chch Central	21.5	-	-	Munro, R.J.S., Invercargill	51.7	-	-
13.	Cullen, Hon. Dr M.J., St. Kilda	20.6	-	-	East, P.C., Rotorua	48.0	27.9	-
14.	Sutherland, L.A., Avon	17.9	-	-	Richardson, R.M., Selwyn	47.0	-	-
15.	Hunt, Hon. J.L., New Lynn	17.6	-	0.6	Falloon, Rt. Hon. J.H., Pahiatua	44.7	-	-
16.	Tapsell, Hon. P., Eastern Maori	17.4	-	-	Young, Hon. V.S., Waitotara	42.3	-	-
17.	Shirley, K.L., Tasman	17.0	-	-	Banks, J.A., Whangarei	35.4	-	-
18.	Jeffries, Hon. W.P., Heretaunga	15.1	-	-	Meurant, A.R., Hobson	32.7	-	-
19.	Anderton, J.P., Sydenham	14.9	-	-	Kydd, W.J., Clevedon	27.1	-	-
20.	Robertson, H.V.R., Papatoetoe	14.2	-	-	Wellington, Hon. M.L., Papakura	25.6	-	-
21.	Boorman, R.G., Wairarapa	12.3	-	-	McKinnon, D.C., Albany	22.2	-	-
22.	Dillon, J.G., Hamilton East	12.3	-	-	Grant, J.J., Awarua	20.8	-	-
23.	Woolaston, Hon. P.T.E., Nelson	11.7	-	-	Graham, D.A.M. , Remuera	18.8	-	-
24.	Fraser, L.A., East Cape	11.5	-	-	Gray, R.M., Clutha	16.6	-	-
25.	Wetere, Hon. K.T., Western Maori	11.3	-	-	McTigue, M.P., Timaru	12.1	-	-
26.	Matthewson, C.D., Dunedin West	10.6	-	-	Angus, D.A., Wallace	11.3	-	-
27.	Maxwell, R.K. Titirangi	9.4	-	-	Upton, S.D., Raglan	11.0	-	-
28.	Dunne, P.F., Ohariu	9.3	0.6	-	Luxton, M.J.F., Matamata	10.4	-	-
29.	Wallbank, A.R., Gisborne	8.7	-	-	McCully, M.S., East Coast Bays	9.3	-	-
30.	Moore, Hon. M.K., Christchurch North	8.6	23.0	-	Carter, J.M., Bay of Islands	7.6	-	-
31.	Keall, J.M., Glenfield	8.4	-	-	Muldoon, Rt. Hon. Sir R.D., Tamaki	7.4	-	-
32.	Moyle, Hon. C.J., Otara	8.1	-	-	McClay, R.N. Waikaremoana	6.9	-	24.5

* = measured in column centimetres (c.cm.)

Table 12 ctd...

No.	Labour Party	Hansard Issue Sample	State Sector Bill	Labour Relations Amdt Bill	National Party	Hansard Issue Sample	State Sector Bill	Labour Relations Amdt Bill
33.	Bassett, Hon. Dr M.E.R., Te Atatu	7.5	-	-	Lee, G.E., Hauraki	4.9	-	-
34.	Shields, Hon. M.K., Kapiti	7.5	-	-	O'Regan, K.V., Waipa	0.7	-	-
35.	Scott, N., Tongariro	6.7	-	-	Anderson, R.A., Kaimai	-	-	-
36.	Terris, J.J., Western Hutt	6.7	-	-	Gair, Hon. G.F., North Shore	-	-	-
37.	Braybrooke, G.B., Napier	5.0	-	-	Gerard, R.J., Rangiora	-	-	-
38.	Mallard, T.C., Hamilton West	4.9	19.7	25.3	Smith, Dr A.L., Kaipara	-	-	-
39.	Neilson, Hon. P., Miramar	4.7	-	-	Williamson, M.D., Pakuranga	-	-	-
40.	Clark, Hon. H.E., Mt Albert	4.3	-	-				
41.	Austin, M.E., Yaldhurst	3.6	-	-				
42.	Young, T.J., Eastern Hutt	3.3	-	-				
43.	Wilde, Hon. F.H., Wellington Central	2.1	-	-				
44.	Gerbic, F.M., Onehunga	2.0	-	-				
45.	Tirikatene-Sullivan, Hon. T.W.M., Southern Maori	2.0	-	-				
46.	Gregory, Dr B.C., Northern Maori	1.3	-	-				
47.	Rodger, Hon. S.J., Dunedin North	1.0	39.4	-				
48.	Burke, Hon. T.K., West Coast	-	-	-				
49.	Davies, S.M.L., Pencarrow	-	-	-				
50.	Duynhaven, H.J., New Plymouth	-	-	-				
51.	Elder, J.A., West Auckland	-	-	-				
52.	Kelly, G.D., Porirua	-	-	-				
53.	Kirk, J.N., Birkenhead	-	-	-				
54.	Lange, Rt. Hon. D.R., Mangere	-	-	-				
55.	Marshall, Hon. C.R., Wanganui	-	-	-				
56.	Robinson, D.J., Manawatu	-	-	-				
57.	Simpson, Dr P.A., Lyttelton	-	-	-				
58.	Tizard, Rt. Hon. R.J., Panmure	-	-	-				
	TOTAL	921.2	82.7	25.9	**TOTAL**	1215.9	138.4	70.0

Of the ten women Labour MP's, three members, Patricia Tennet, Annette King, and Lawson Anne Fraser, scored above the median.

Eleven MP's were recorded as having not spoken on any industrial relations subject matter. Amongst these were included the Prime Minister, two Ministers, the Speaker of the House, and seven backbenchers including two women.

(b) The State Sector Bill (1R)

Four Labour MP's contributed to the industrial relations content of the State Sector Bill (1R). These were the Minister of Labour, Stanley Rodger (39.4 c.cm), the Minister of Overseas Trade and Marketing, Michael Moore (23 c.cm), the Junior Whip, Trevor Mallard (19.7 c.cm); and Parliamentary Under-Secretary Peter Dunne (0.6 c.cm). The average score was 20.7 c.cm.

(c) The Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R)

Industrial relations content in the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) was recorded for only two Labour MP's: the Junior Whip, Trevor Mallard (25.3 c.cm), and the Minister of State and Leader of the House, Jonathan Hunt (0.6 c.cm).

National Party

(a) Sample Hansard Issues

The average amount of industrial relations content recorded for the Opposition was 31.2 c.cm, with a median of 25.6 c.cm. Of the 26 Opposition Spokespersons, including Associate status but excluding the Senior and Junior Whips, 15 or about 58 percent had scores above the median, with scores ranging from 81.7 c.cm. to 27.1 c.cm. The Senior Whip, Robert Gray, and the Junior Whip, Maurice McTigue, scored below the median.

Taking the top ten recordings the Associate Spokesperson on Overseas Trade and Transport, William Storey, recorded the highest score at 81.7 c.cm, followed by Philip Burdon (74.6 c.cm), William Birch (68.5 c.cm), Douglas Kidd (64.4 c.cm), Winston Peters (61.0 c.cm), Warren Cooper (60.8 c.cm), Jennifer Shipley (59.4 c.cm), Dennis Marshall (59.2 c.cm), Ian McLean (59.1 c.cm), and the Leader of the Opposition, James Bolger (57.4 c.cm).

Of the three women National MP's, two members, Jennifer Shipley and Ruth Richardson, scored above the median. Five male MP's were recorded as not having spoken on any industrial relations subject matter. Amongst these were included three Spokespersons and two MP's with no specific responsibilities.

(b) The State Sector Bill (1R)

Five Opposition MP's contributed to the industrial relations content of the State Sector Bill (1R): Spokesperson for Labour, and State Services, William Birch (50.9 c.cm.); Spokesperson for Attorney-General, and Justice, Paul East (27.9 c.cm.), Associate Spokesperson for Employment, and Labour, Roger Maxwell (25.8 c.cm.), Spokesperson for SOE's, Forest and Lands, Post Office, Ian McLean (21.4 c.cm.), and the Leader of the Opposition, James Bolger (12.4 c.cm.). The average score was 27.7 c.cm..

(c) The Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R)

Three Opposition MP's were recorded as having spoken on matters of an industrial relations nature in the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R). These were: Spokesperson for Housing, Conservation and Environment, Roger McClay (24.5 c.cm), Spokesperson for Labour, and State Services, William Birch (23.0 c.cm), and Associate Spokesperson for SOE's, Forest and Lands, Post Office, Roger Maxwell (22.5 c.cm).

5.2 SUBJECT MATTER

5.2.1 Industrial Relations Categories

Table 13 shows the distribution of the major industrial relations categories across the twelve sample Hansard issues according to each sample day and month. To test for the degree and strength of association between the various industrial relations categories, across all the sample Hansard issues, Pearson Correlation Coefficients were calculated. These coefficients, along with significance probabilities, are shown in Table 14. Those categories which showed a moderate to good relationship included: Industrial Action, and Union-Employee Action/Statements/Views ($r = 0.74$); Economic Context, and Industrial Developments ($r = 0.76$); State Agency, and Employers-Managers Actions/Statements/Views ($r = 0.69$); State Agency, and Work and Conditions ($r = 0.62$); Economic Context, and Political Action/ Statements/Views ($r = 0.72$).

The number of items occurring within each industrial relations category for the sample Hansard issues and each elected sample bill are shown in Table 15 and analysed below.

Sample Hansard Issues

Items of an Economic Context were the most prominent category, accounting for 44 percent of all items. The next highest category was Work and Conditions (22.6 percent), followed well behind by the categories of Industrial Developments (11.5 percent), Political Action/Views/Statements (8.2 percent), Negotiations and Communication (4.4 percent), Union-Employee and Employer-Manager Action/Statements/Views (about three percent respectively), and State Agency (2.5 percent). There were only three items recorded for the category of Industrial Action and no items for the category of 'Other'.

Table 13: Distribution of Industrial Relations Categories Across All Sample Hansard Issues

Category	Month	October '87		December		March '88		May		July		September		Total
	Date	6	7	1	3	2	3	3	4	26	28	8	21	
Industrial Action		2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Negotiations/ Communications		-	-	1	1	6	3	-	-	5	3	-	6	25
Economic Context		17	21	6	10	12	-	15	29	54	57	-	27	248
Political Action, Views, Statements		3	6	-	1	3	2	1	6	3	19	-	2	46
State Agency		-	-	-	-	-	9	5	-	-	-	-	-	14
Union-Employee Action, Views, Statements		10	2	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	-	18
Employers-Manager Action, Views, Statements		-	-	1	1	-	4	4	2	1	-	-	4	17
Work and Conditions		8	6	13	9	4	40	2	2	13	25	1	4	127
Industrial Developments		4	5	4	6	8	3	-	1	12	19	1	2	65
Other		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 14: Industrial Relations Categories - Pearson Correlation Coefficients[1] and Significance Probabilities[2]

Industrial Relations Categories	Industrial Action	Negotiations/ Communications	Economic Context	Political Action, Statements, Views	State Agency	Union-Employee Action, State-ments, Views	Employers-Manager Action, Statements, Views	Work and Conditions	Industrial Developments	Other
Industrial Action	1.0 0.0	-0.32 0.3169	-0.17 0.5927	-0.16 0.6290	-0.18 0.5771	0.74 0.0058	-0.28 0.3718	-0.04 0.9137	-0.11 0.7234	-
Negotiation/ Communication	-0.32 0.3169	1.0 0.0	0.35 0.2663	0.10 0.7681	-0.03 0.9302	-0.28 0.3867	0.17 0.5989	0.21 0.5044	0.42 0.1773	-
Economic Context	-0.17 0.5927	0.35 0.2663	1.0 0.0	0.72 0.0089	-0.37 0.2433	-0.25 0.4252	-0.16 0.6183	0.07 0.8170	0.74 0.0063	-
Political Actions, Statements, Views	-0.16 0.6290	0.10 0.7681	0.72 0.0089	1.0 0.0	-0.19 0.5564	-0.10 0.7625	-0.31 0.3332	0.32 0.3057	0.76 0.0039	-
State Agency	-0.18 0.5771	-0.03 0.9302	-0.37 0.2433	-0.19 0.5564	1.0 0.0	0.25 0.4337	0.69 0.0136	0.62 0.0325	-0.29 0.3673	-
Union-Employee Action, Statements, Views	0.74 0.0058	-0.28 0.3867	-0.25 0.4252	-0.10 0.7625	0.25 0.4337	1.0 0.0	-0.10 0.7632	0.27 0.4032	-0.17 0.5926	-
Employers-Manager Action, Statements, Views	-0.28 0.3718	0.17 0.5989	-0.16 0.6183	-0.31 0.3332	0.69 0.0136	1.0 0.0	-0.10 0.7632	0.27 0.4032	-0.17 0.5926	-
Work & Conditions	-0.04 0.9137	0.21 0.5044	0.08 0.8170	0.32 0.3057	0.62 0.0325	0.27 0.4032	0.20 0.5245	1.0 0.0	0.40 0.1969	-
Industrial Develop-ments	-0.11 0.7234	0.42 0.18	0.74 0.0063	0.76 0.0039	-0.29 0.3673	-0.17 0.5926	-0.48 0.1145	0.40 0.1969	1.0 0.0	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[1] Rounded to second digit

[2] Four digit numbers. H_0: Rho = 0

Table 15: Distribution of Items Within Each Industrial Relations Category for the Sample Hansard Issues and Each Elected Sample Bill.

Category	Hansard Issues No.	%	State Sector Bill 1R No.	%	Labour Relations Amdt. Bill 3R No.	%
Industrial Action	3	0.5	1	1.2	-	-
Negotiations/ Communication	25	4.4	1	1.2	2	5.4
Economic Context	248	44.0	-	-	-	-
Political Action, Views, Statements	46	8.2	24	27.9	13	35.1
State Agency	14	2.5	1	1.2	-	-
Union-Employee Action, Views, Statements	18	3.2	3	3.5	1	2.7
Employers-Manager Action, Views	17	3.0	-	-	-	-
Work and Conditions	127	22.6	55	64	21	56.8
Industrial Developments	65	11.5	1	1.2	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	563		86		37	

State Sector Bill (1R)

Work and Conditions was the highest category, accounting for 64 percent of all items, followed by Political Action/Views/Statements (about 28 percent). Well behind these two categories were the categories of Union-Employee Action/Statements/Views (3.5 percent), and Industrial Action, Negotiations/Communication, State Agency, and Industrial Developments which recorded only one item each. The categories of Economic Context, Employers-

recorded only one item each. The categories of Economic Context, Employers-Manager Action/Statement/Views, and Other recorded no items.

Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R)

Similarly, the category of Work and Conditions accounted for about 57 percent of all items, followed by the category of Political Actions/Views/Statements (around 35 percent). Well behind were the categories of Negotiation/Communication (5.4 percent), and Union-Employee Action/Statements/Views (2.7 percent). There were no items recorded for the categories of Industrial Action, Economic Context, State Agency, Employer-Manager Action/Statements/Views, Industrial Developments, and Other.

5.2.2 Sub-Analysis of Industrial Relations Categories

Items falling into the various industrial relations categories were submitted to further analysis. Table 16 shows the distribution of items within each industrial relations sub-category for the sample Hansard issues and each elected sample bill. The various sub-categories under each major category are discussed below.

(a) Industrial Action

Sample Hansard Issues (three items). The initiators of industrial action were equally spread between union-employees and employer-manager sub-categories. Two of the items were located regionally and one item nationally. The type of actions involved a strike, the ban, and industrial action in general.

State Sector Bill (1R) (one item). The initiator was not ascertainable, the location was national, and the type of action related to negotiations/statements over ongoing action.

There were no items for the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R).

Table 16: Distribution of Items Within Each Industrial Relations Sub-Category.

Category & Sub-Category	Sample Hansard Issues	State Sector Bill (1R)	Labour Relations Amdnt. Bill (3R)
1. Industrial Action			
1.1 **Initiator**			
a. Union-employee initiated.	1		-
b. Employer-manager initiated.	-		-
c. Mixture of a and b.	1		-
d. Not ascertainable.	1	1	-
e. Other.	-	-	-
1.2 **Location**			
a. Local.	-	-	-
b. Regional.	2	-	-
c. National.	1	1	-
d. Amalgam of a, b, and c.	-	-	-
e. Not ascertainable.	-	-	-
1.3 **Type of action**			
a. Strike.	1	-	-
b. Mass resignation.	-	-	-
c. Go slow.	-	-	-
d. The ban (overtime, load-out, black).	1	-	-
e. Lockout.	-	-	-
f. Mass notice of dismissal.	-	-	-
g. Return to work.	-	-	-
h. Industrial action in general.	1	-	-
i. Negotiations/statements over past action.	-	1	
j. Negotiations/statements over ongoing action.	-	-	-
k. Negotiations/statements about impending action.	-	-	-
l. Other.	-	-	-
2. Negotiations, Mediation, Conciliation, Arbitration, Communication			
2.1 **Types of Negotiations covered**			
a. Union-Employer Management.	-	-	1
b. Union-Government.	2	1	-
c. Employer/Management-Government.	16	-	-
d. Union-Union.	-	-	-
e. Employer/Management-Employer/ Management.	-	-	-
f. Union, Employer/Management, Government.	4	-	1
g. Other.	3	-	-

Table 16 ctd...

Category & Sub-Category	Sample Hansard Issues	State Sector Bill (1R)	Labour Relations Amdnt. Bill (3R)
2.2 **Topic of Negotiation.**			
a. Dispute of interest (i.e. awards and agreements).	-	-	-
b. Dispute of rights (i.e. over interpretation of awards and agreements).	1	-	-
c. Personal grievance.	-	-	-
d. Demarcation dispute.	-	-	-
e. Collective agreements.	-	-	-
f. Wage and allowance negotiations.	3	-	-
g. Items mentioning the collapse of negotiations except where industrial action is being specifically planned.	6	-	-
h. Items mentioning favourable progress or successful outcome.	6	1	-
i. Items mentioning the unwillingness of parties to agree or negotiation.	-	-	-
j. Items mentioning the situation as a stalemate.	-	-	-
k. Items dealing with the role of a third party in negotiations.	9	-	2
l. Other.	-	-	-
3. Economic Context			
a. Cost of living, buying power of wages.	3	-	-
b. General economic well-being of the country including items on the balance of payments, trade figures, inflation.	39	-	-
c. Economic well-being of a private or public company.	5	-	-
d. Economic well-being of a State-Owned Enterprise or Government Corporation, or Government Dept.	14	-	-
e. Economic well-being of a particular sector or group in society.	65	-	-
f. Unemployment.	116	-	-
g. An amalgam of all the above.	6	-	-
h. Other.	-	-	-
4. Political Action/Statements/Views			
a. By the Government.	16	8	4
b. By the Opposition.	30	16	9
c. By others.	-	-	-

Table 16 ctd...

Category & Sub-Category	Sample Hansard Issues	State Sector Bill (1R)	Labour Relations Amdnt. Bill (3R)
5. State Agency			
a. Wage determining agency.	-	1	-
b. Proposed agencies.	14	-	-
c. Others.	-	-	-
6. Union-Employee Action/Statements/Views			
a. Federation of Labour, Trade Union movement.	6	-	-
b. Unions, Associations, Guilds.	12	3	1
c. Individual employees.	-	-	-
d. Other.	-	-	-
7. Employers-Manager Action/Statements/Views			
a. State Owned Enterprises, Government Corporations or Government Departments.	5	-	-
b. Employers Associations.	8	-	-
c. Others.	4	-	-
8. Work and Conditions			
a. Health and/or safety.	4	-	-
b. Hours of work.	2	-	-
c. Holidays	-	-	-
d. Work skills and activities.	11	-	-
e. Performance-effectiveness employers/management.	12	2	-
f. Performance-effectiveness employee.	1	-	-
g. Amalgam of d, e, and f.	13	-	-
h. Procedures, rules, regulations, safeguards, controls.	29	5	-
i. Job satisfaction, morale.	3	-	-
j. Powers and responsibilities	7	17	-
k. Personnel (planning, job analysis, recruitment, job selection and placement, job evaluation and appraisal, motivation, compensation, training and development, career development).	45	31	21
l. Other conditions.	-	-	-
9. Industrial Developments			
a. State Owned Enterprises, Government Corporations, or Government Departments.	43	1	-
b. Other.	22	-	-
10. Others.	-	-	-

(b) Negotiations/Communication

Sample Hansard Issues (25 items). Employer/management-Government accounted for the highest type of negotiations covered (16 items), followed by union, employer/management (four items), other (three items), and union-Government (two items). Topics of negotiation included third party negotiations (nine items), collapse of negotiations (six items), items mentioning favourable progress or successful outcome (six items), wage and allowance negotiations (three items), and dispute of rights (one item).

State Sector Bill (1R) (one item). The type of negotiation covered was between union-Government with the topic being the favourable progress or successful outcome of negotiations.

Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) (two items). The types of negotiations concerned union-employer/management and union-employer/management, Government. Both items dealt with the role of a third party in negotiations.

(c) Economic Context

Sample Hansard Issues (248 items). Unemployment was the highest sub-category (116 items), followed by the economic well-being of a particular sector or group (65 items), economic well-being of the country (39 items), economic well-being of a State Owned Enterprise, or Government Corporation, or Government Department (14 items), an amalgam of all the economic sub-categories (six items), economic well-being of a private or public company (five items), and cost of living (three items).

There were no items for the State Sector Bill (1R) or the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R).

(d) Political Action/Statements/Views

Sample Hansard Issues (46 items). The Opposition made the most statements in this category (30 items), followed by the Government (16 items).

State Sector Bill (1R) (24 items). The Opposition accounted for 16 items, and the Government eight items.

Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) (13 items). Similarly, the Opposition recorded the highest number of items (nine items), with the Government recording four items.

(e) State Agency

Sample Hansard Issues (14 items). The sub-category of proposed agencies accounted for all 14 items.

State Sector Bill (1R) (one item). The one item mentioned concerned a wage determining agency.

There were no items for the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R).

(f) Union-Employee Action/Statements/Views

Sample Hansard Issues (1R) (18 items). Unions or associations was the highest sub-category, with 12 items, followed by the Federation of Labour, Trade Union movement (six items).

State Sector Bill (1R) (three items). The three items mentioned focused on the sub-category of Unions, Associations, Guilds.

Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) (one item). Only one item was recorded, this being for the sub-category of Unions, Associations, Guilds.

(g) Employers-Manager Action/Statements/Views

Sample Hansard Issues (17 items). The sub-category of Employers Associations recorded eight items, followed by State Owned Enterprises, Government Corporations, or Government Departments (five items), and others (four items).

There were no items recorded for the State Sector Bill (1R) or the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R).

(h) Work and Conditions

Sample Hansard Issues (127 items). Matters of a personnel nature accounted for the highest number of items (45 items). The next highest sub-category was procedures and rules (29 items), followed by an amalgam of employee-employer work skill/performance activities (13 items), performance-effectiveness employers/management (12 items), work skills and activities (11 items), powers and responsibilities (seven items), health and/or safety (four items), job satisfaction, morale (three items), hours of work (two items), and performance-effectiveness employee (one item).

State Sector Bill (1R) (55 items). Personnel was the highest sub-category with 31 items, followed by powers and responsibilities (17 items), procedures and rules (five items), and performance-effectiveness employers/ management (two items).

Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) (21 items). The sub-category of personnel accounted for all 21 items.

(i) Industrial Developments

Sample Hansard Issues (65 items). State Owned Enterprises, Government Corporations, or Government Departments was the highest sub-

category with 43 items, followed by the sub-category of other, with 22 items.

State Sector Bill (1R) (one item). Only one item was recorded, this being the sub-category of State Owned Enterprises, Government Corporations, or Government Departments.

There were no items recorded for the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R).

(j) Others.

There were no items recorded for this category.

5.2.3 Causes and Effects

Items falling within the category of industrial action were further analysed according to the types of causes and effects given by the Members of Parliament. As noted previously, only three industrial action items were recorded in the Sample Hansard Issues. These were spoken by Opposition MP's Alan Meurant, Jeffrey Grant, and Denis Marshall. Of the three items, only one item mentioned 'cause' and 'effect', this being spoken by Alan Meurant. He portrayed the 'cause' of industrial action as the employer being presented with demands from the union, and the 'effect' as economic loss or hardship to the contractor. Both 'cause' and 'effect' were coded as elaborated (i.e. evolving over two or more sentences).

In the State Sector Bill (1R) only one industrial action item was recorded, this being spoken by Parliamentary Under-Secretary Peter Dunne. Although he attributed no 'cause' to the industrial action, he gave the effect as being the deregulation of the Public Service Association. The 'effect' was coded as unelaborated (i.e. consisting of a single sentence statement).

There were no industrial action items recorded for the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R).

5.2.4 Negotiations/Communications

Those items which were coded within the category of negotiations, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and communication, were further coded according to the politician making the statement and her or his political party. Table 17 shows the distribution of negotiations/communication items according to political party and politicians for the sample Hansard issues and the sample bills.

Table 17: Distribution of Negotiations/Communication Items According to Political Party and Politician.

Sample	Labour Party	No.	National Party	No.
Hansard Issues	Northey, R.J.	3	Birch, Hon. W.F.	4
	Sutton, Dr W.D.	3	Richardson, R.M.	3
	Douglas, Hon. R.D.	2	Burdon, P.R.	2
	Butcher, Hon. D.J.	1	McLean, I.	2
	Prebble, Hon. R.W.	1	Bolger, Hon. J.B.	1
			East, P.C.	1
			Kydd, W.J.	1
			Peters, W.	1
State Sector Bill (1R)	Rodger, Hon. S.T.	1	-	
Industrial Relations Amendment Bill (3R)	Mallard, T.C.	1	Maxwell, R.	1

Sample Hansard Issues. The Opposition recorded 15 items compared to the Government's ten items. In the Opposition, William Birch recorded four items, followed by Ruth Richardson (three items), and Philip Burdon and Ian McLean (two items respectively). James Bolger, Paul East, Warren Kydd, and Winston Peters recorded one item each.

For the Government Richard Northey and Dr William Sutton recorded three items each, followed by three Cabinet Ministers: Roger Douglas (two items), and David Butcher and Richard Prebble with one item each.

State Sector Bill (1R). The Government recorded only one item, this being spoken by the Minister of Labour Stanley Rodger. The Opposition recorded no items.

Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R). The Junior Whip, Trevor Mallard, recorded one item for the Government, and Roger Maxwell recorded one item for the Opposition.

5.2.5 Object, Attitude, and Tone of MPs Comments

Each time a member's comment was recorded, the object, attitude, and tone of the comment was also noted. (The actual coding process and descriptions of these terms are outlined in Chapter two). The results for the sample Hansard issues and the elected sample bills, according to political party, are shown in Table 18.

a. Sample Hansard Issues. Overall, the Opposition accounted for 57 percent of the comments compared to the Government's 43 percent.

Object. The majority of comments, about 98 percent, were 'substantive' (i.e. pertaining to the motion or bill), with 'procedural' (e.g. point of order) and 'interruptive' comments making up the remaining two percent. Of the 549 'substantive' comments, the Opposition accounted

Table 18: Object, Attitude, and Tone of MP's Comments According to Political Party

Sample	Object of the Comment						Attitude of the Comment[2]						Tone of the Comment					
	Substantive[1]		Procedural		Interruptive		Generally Favourable		Generally Unfavourable		Mixed Neutral, Not Ascertainable		Conflict Creating		Moderating		Mixed Neutral, Not Ascertainable	
	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N	L	N
Hansard Issues n = 563	240	309	2	2	-	10	198	36	11	93	63	162	72	193	30	10	140	118
State Sector Bill (1R) n = 86	28	49	-	-	4	5	27	1	1	40	4	13	13	41	1	-	18	13
Labour Relations Amdt. Bill (3R) n = 37	9	24	-	-	3	1	8	1	2	22	2	2	2	14	-	-	10	11

L = Labour Party

N = National Party

1. i.e. pertaining to the motion or bill.

2. i.e. generally favourable or generally unfavourable towards the object of the comment.

for 56.3 percent and the Government 43.7 percent. Four 'procedural' comments were recorded, with two items from each party. The Opposition accounted for all ten 'interruptive' items.

Attitude. 'Generally favourable' comments accounted for 41.6 percent of the items, 'generally unfavourable' comments 18.5 percent, and 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' about 40 percent. Of the 234 'generally favourable' comments, about 85 percent were made by the Government and about 15 percent by the Opposition. There were 104 'generally unfavourable' comments; about 89 percent belonging to the Opposition and about 11 percent to the Government. 'Mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' comments accounted for 225 items, with 72 percent of these being made by the Opposition and 28 percent by the Government.

Tone. 'Conflict creating' comments accounted for about 47 percent of all the comments, followed by 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' with about 46 percent, and 'moderating' comments with about seven percent. Of the 265 'conflict creating' comments, about 73 percent were made by Opposition members and 27 percent by the Government. Forty 'moderating' comments were recorded, 75 percent by the Government and 25 percent by the Opposition. Of the 258 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' comments, the Government accounted for about 54 percent and the Opposition 46 percent.

b. State Sector Bill (1R). Overall, the Opposition accounted for 63 percent and the Government 33 percent of the comments.

Object. The majority of comments, about 90 percent, were 'substantive' whereas only nine 'interruptive' and no 'procedural' comments were recorded. Of the 77 'substantive' comments, about 64 percent were made by the Opposition and 36 percent by the Government. The number of 'interruptive' comments between the two parties was about even, the Opposition recording five and the Government four comments.

Attitude. The majority of comments were 'generally unfavourable', about 48 percent, followed by 'generally favourable' (about 33 percent) and 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' comments (about 20 percent). Of the 28 'generally favourable' comments, 27 were made by the Government and only one by the Opposition. The Opposition made 13 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' comments compared to the Government's four comments.

Tone. The majority of comments were 'conflict creating' (about 63 percent), followed by 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' (36 percent) and 'moderate' comments (about one percent). Of the 54 'conflict creating' comments, about 76 percent were made by the Opposition and 24 percent by the Government. Only one 'moderating' comment was recorded, this being made by the Government. The Government accounted for about 58 percent of the 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' comments, followed by the Opposition with 42 percent.

c. Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R). Overall, the Opposition accounted for about 68 percent, and the Government 32 percent of the comments.

Object. Of the 37 comments recorded, about 89 percent were 'substantive' and 11 percent 'interruptive' comments. There were no 'procedural' comments. The Government accounted for about 73 percent and the Opposition 27 percent of the 'substantive' comments. The Government recorded three 'interruptive' comments compared to the Opposition's one 'interruptive' comment.

Attitude. About 65 percent of the comments were 'generally unfavourable', followed by 'generally favourable' (24 percent), and 'mixed,

neutral, not ascertainable' (11 percent). Of the 24 'generally unfavourable' comments, about 92 percent were made by the Opposition and only eight percent by the Government. The Government accounted for eight of the 'generally favourable' comments compared to one comment by the Opposition. Both the Government and Opposition accounted for two 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' comments each.

Tone. The majority of comments, about 57 percent, were recorded as 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' followed by 'conflict creating' comments (43 percent). There were no 'moderating' comments. The Opposition accounted for about 52 percent of the 'mixed, neutral, not ascertainable' comments and the Government 48 percent. The Opposition also accounted for about 88 percent of 'conflict creating' comments compared to the Government's 12 percent.

5.2.6 Moderating Comments

Since 'moderating' verbal behaviour, as opposed to 'conflict creating', behaviour was assumed as a desirable attribute for politicians to have, all items coded as 'moderating' were further analysed according to politician and political party. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 19.

a. Sample Hansard Issues. Overall, 41 'moderating' comments were recorded, 76 percent by the Government and 24 percent by the Opposition.

Government. Of the 47 MP's who recorded any comments, 14 or about 30 percent recorded comments that were 'moderating' in tone, with an average of 2.2 moderating comments each. These included eight Ministers, one Associate Minister, and five backbenchers. More specifically, Harold Robertson accounted for five 'moderating comments' followed by Richard Northey and

Table 19: Moderating Comments According to Politician and Political Party

Sample	Labour Party	Moderating Comments No.	National Party	Moderating Comments No.
Hansard Issues n=41	Bassett, Hon Dr M.E.	1	Birch, Hon. W.F.	2
	Butcher, Hon D.J.	2	Carter, J.M.	1
	Douglas, Hon. R.D	2	McClay, R.N.	1
	Hunt, Hon. J.L.	2	Marshall, D.W.A.	1
	Matthewson, C.D.	1	Munro, R.J.S.	1
	Moore, Hon. M.K.	1	Upton, S.D.	4
	Neilson, Hon. P.	2		
	Northey, R.J.	4		
	Robertson, H.V.R.	5		
	Shields, Hon. M.K.	1		
	Sutton, J.R.	1		
	Sutton, Dr W.D.	3		
	Tapsell, Hon. P.	4		
	Wetere, Hon. K.T.	2		
State Sector Bill (1R) n=1	Mallard, T.C.	1	-	-
Labour Relations Amendment Bill	-	-	-	-

Peter Tapsell with four comments each. William Sutton recorded three 'moderating' comments followed by David Butcher, Roger Douglas, Jonathon Hunt, Peter Neilson, and Koro Wetere with two comments each. Michael Bassett, Clive Matthewson, Michael Moore, Margaret Shields, and James Sutton recorded one 'moderating' comment each.

Opposition. Of the 34 MP's who recorded any comments, only six or about 18 percent recorded comments that were 'moderating' in tone with an average of about 1.7 moderating comments each. These included three Spokespersons, one Associate Spokesperson, and two backbenchers. More specifically, Simon Upton recorded four 'moderating' comments followed by William Birch (two), and John Carter, Roger McClay, Denis Marshall, and Robert Munro with one comment each.

b. State Sector Bill (1R). Of the 4 Government MP's who recorded any comments, only one 'moderating' comment was recorded. This was by the Junior Whip, Trevor Mallard. Of the five Opposition MP's who recorded any comments none made any comments which were 'moderating' in tone.

c. Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R). Of the two Government and three Opposition MP's who recorded any comments, none of their comments were 'moderating' in tone.

5.2.7 Frequency of Participant Types and Quotations

The frequency with which each participant type appeared in industrial relations items, along with those either directly or indirectly quoted, across all the sample Hansard issues and elected sample bills are presented in Table 20. As previously described in Chapter Four the data were collected in such a way that each participant type was checked only once for each item.

Table 20: Frequency of Participant Types and Quotations Across All Sample Hansard Issues and Elected Sample Bills

Participant Types	Sample Hansard Issues	Quoted No.	State Sector Bill (1R) + LR Amdt. Bill (3R)	Quoted No.	Participant Types	Sample Hansard Issues	Quoted No.	State Sector Bill (1R) + LR Amdt. Bill (3R)	Quoted No.
Boards	14	1	1	-	Ministers	96	17	22	3
Cabinet (General)	4	-	2	-	Members of Parliament (General)	10	2	2	-
Consultants/Experts	9	1	-	-	Managers	53	1	5	-
Employers (General)	32	-	2	-	Ministerial Committee	3	-	-	-
Employers (Specific)	78	1	1	-	News Media	11	7	-	-
Employers-Employees	18	-	1	-	National Government	21	-	-	-
Employers-Managers-Employees	7	-	-	-	National Party	4	-	-	-
Employers-Managers	36	-	27	-	Opposition Members	119	13	35	-
Employees	113	-	14	-	Public	134	-	21	-
Employees-Managers	92	-	27	-	Parliament	25	-	15	-
Employers Associations/ Representatives	24	5	-	-	Prime Minister	11	5	16	-
Exporters	4	-	-	-	State Bodies/Quangos	45	1	24	-
Government (General)	71	1	35	-	Select Committees	24	2	6	-
Government subsidised programmes	10	1	-	-	Trade Unions/Associations/Guilds	37	11	31	-
Govt Depts/SOE's/ Corporations	50	-	10	-	Union Officials	8	3	2	-
Government Members	25	2	15	1	Unemployed	87	-	-	-
Labour Party	11	1	11	-	Other	30	2	3	-
Local Bodies/Officials	14	-	-	-					
SUB-TOTALS	612	13	146	1		718	64	182	3
					GRAND TOTAL	1330	77	328	4

a. Sample Hansard Issues.

Participant Types. A total of 1330 item content participants were recorded with an average of 2.4 participant types per item. The 'public' featured the most prominently (10.1 percent) followed closely by 'opposition members' (8.9 percent) and 'employees' (8.5 percent). The next highest participant types included 'Ministers' (7.2 percent), 'employees-managers' (6.9 percent), and the 'unemployed' (6.5 percent). 'Employers (specific)' accounted for 5.9 percent of all participant types, followed by the 'government (general)' (5.3 percent), 'managers' (four percent), 'government, state owned enterprises, corporations' (3.8 percent), 'state bodies/quangos' (3.4 percent), and 'trade unions, associations, guilds' (2.8 percent).

Less obvious were 'employers-managers' (2.7 percent), 'employers (general)' (2.4 percent), 'other' (2.3 percent), 'government members' (1.9 percent), 'parliament' (1.9 percent), 'employers associations/ representatives' (1.8 percent), 'National government' (1.6 percent), 'employers/employees' (1.4 percent), and 'Boards', 'local bodies/officials' with about one percent each.

Those participants who appeared in less than one percent each of the total participant types included: 'Cabinet (general)', 'consultants/ experts', 'employers-managers-employees', 'exporters', 'government subsidised programmes', 'Labour Party', 'Members of Parliament (general)', 'ministerial committee', 'news media', 'National Party', 'Prime Minister', and 'union officials'.

Quotations. Of the 1330 participants recorded, only 77 or 5.8 percent were either directly or indirectly quoted. The most prominent participant types quoted were 'Ministers' (17) followed closely behind by

unions/associations/guilds' (11), followed by the 'news media' (seven), and the 'Prime Minister' and 'employers associations/representatives' (five each). The less obvious participant types quoted included 'union officials' (three), 'government members', 'Members of Parliament', 'select committees' (two each), followed by 'Boards', 'consultants/experts', 'employers (specific)', 'government (general)', 'government subsidised programmes', 'Labour Party', 'managers', and 'state bodies/quangos' with one quotation each.

b. State Sector Bill (1R) and Labour Relations Amdt Bill (3R)

Participant Types. A total of 328 participants were recorded with an average of 2.7 participant types per item. The 'government (general)' and 'opposition members' featured most prominently with 35 items each. Next highest were 'trade unions/associations/guilds' (31), 'employers-managers' and 'employees/managers' (27 each), 'state bodies/quangos' (24), 'Ministers' (22), and the 'public' (21). These were followed by the Prime Minister (16), 'parliament' and 'government members' (15 each), 'employees' (14), 'Labour Party' (11), and 'government departments/SOE's,/corporations' (ten). Less obvious were 'select committees' (six), 'managers' (five), 'other' (three), 'Cabinet', 'employers (general)', 'Members of Parliament (general)' and 'union officials' (two each), and 'Boards', 'employers (specific)', and 'employers-employees' (one each).

Quotations. Of the 328 participants recorded only four or about one percent were either directly or indirectly quoted. These involved three 'Ministers', and one 'government member'.

5.2.8 Characterisation of Participant Types

A record was also kept of the way and frequency with which the various participant types were named or described. These are outlined, according to each participant type, across all sample Hansard issues and sample bills, in more detail below.

Boards. These were generally referred to as 'boards' of particular companies such as Bank of New Zealand, Rural Bank, Forestry Corporation, Potato Board, Pesticide Board, Maori Trust Board. Only one descriptive term was used - "fire the board".

Cabinet (general). In the majority of cases this category was referred to as 'Cabinet'. One reference was to 'betters' and one to 'masters'.

Consultants/Experts. This group were usually referred to as 'consultants' or 'experts'. 'Industrial advocates' was used three times and the terms 'specialist' and 'statistician' were used only once each.

Employers (general). This group were usually referred to as 'employers'. Descriptive terms included: 'facing collapse', 'damaged', 'dying', 'struggling', and 'captains of industry'.

Employers (specific). A range of employers were referred to such as petroleum companies (seven), motor vehicle dealers (four), retailers (four), farming industry (one), meat industry (one), and bankers (one).

Employers-employees. Groups such as the real estate sector (one), suppliers (one), accountants (one), and trades people (one) were mentioned. Descriptive terms included: 'facing collapse' and 'struggling to survive'.

Employers-managers-employees. This category referred to the agricultural industry (two), the meat industry (two), and the energy and mining industry (one).

Employers-managers. They were generally referred to by occupational group: farmers (20), manufacturers (three), exporters (two), and dairy owners (one). Descriptive terms for farmers included: 'farmers are not bludgers', 'distressed', 'plight', 'in trouble', 'encumbranced', 'embarrassed', 'dear John', and 'taking their own lives'. Descriptive terms for the other occupational groups consisted of: 'honest wealthy and dishonest wealthy', 'professionals', and 'political appointments'.

Employees. This group featured a number of terms such as 'people' (12), 'staff' (nine), 'employees' (eight), 'working class' (seven), 'officers' (six), 'lowly paid' (four), 'decent workers' (two), 'young workers' (two), 'ordinary' (one), 'young men and women' (one), 'young Maori people' (one), 'mates' (one), 'struggling' (one), 'down trodden' (one), 'poor' (one), 'city slickers' (one), and 'women down at the factory' (one).

Employees-managers. In general this group were referred to as 'staff' (11) or 'people' (eight). Descriptive terms included: 'old, tired, and boring' 'key resource', 'diligent', 'dedicated', 'public servants', 'people well provided for', 'professionals', 'good, loyal, and faithful people', and 'middle-ranking people'.

Employers associations/representatives. This group were always referred to by name, such as 'Motor Trade Association' (five), 'Federated Farmers' (five), 'Manufacturers Federation' (two), 'Potato Growers Federation' (one), and 'New Zealand Vegetable Growers Federation' (one).

Exporters. In all cases this category was simply referred to as 'exporters' (four).

Government (general). The majority of cases in this category mentioned 'government' (126), followed by 'Labour government' (seven), the 'Fourth Labour government' (two), and the 'Crown' (one). Positive terms included 'initiatives', 'bi-partisan approach', 'supportive', 'proud record', 'fair', 'reforming', 'had the guts', 'laid the groundwork', 'encouraged innovation', 'investigative', and 'courageous'.

Negative terms included: 'pack of unethical and incompetent swaggerers', 'panic', 'will not listen', 'economic simpletons', 'lunatics', 'bunch of wimps', 'incompetent', 'lack intellectual grasp', 'driving people to bankruptcy', 'Pontius Pilate', 'negligent', 'secret deals', 'failure', 'sunset policy', 'destroyed opportunities', and 'short sighted'.

Government subsidised programmes. In all cases 'Access' schemes (five) were referred to.

Government Department/State-Owned Enterprise/Corporation. Usually this group was mentioned by name such as 'Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries' (ten), Departments of Conservation (five), Maori Affairs (five), Development Finance Corporation (four), Social Welfare (three), Health (two), Labour (one), Education (one), Inland Revenue (one), Telecom (one), Postbank (one), Land Corporation (one), and Coal Corporation (one). Descriptive terms mentioned included: 'held accountable', 'improve productivity and efficiency', 'soak up unemployment', 'inadequate', 'incompetent', 'efficient', and 'good performers'.

Government Members. These people were generally referred to by region of representation. Overall 15 MPs were mentioned and included

Members for: Hamilton West (13), East Cape (five), Sydenham (four), Waitaki (three), Yaldhurst (two), Northern Maori (one), Hawkes Bay (one), Titirangi (one), Gisborne (one), Horowhenaua (one), Western Auckland (one), Glenfield (one), New Plymouth (one), and Pencarrow (one). They were also referred to as 'government members' (six) and 'backbenchers' (two). Descriptive terms included: 'scoffing and laughing', 'interjecting', 'scab', 'doormat for Rogernomics', and 'supporter of people'.

Labour Party. In most cases this category was referred to as the 'Labour Party'. It was also referred to as 'latter day socialists' (one), 'collapsing' (one), and 'going forward' (one).

Local Bodies/officials. This group were referred to by such names as 'Catchment Boards' (four), 'city councils' (two), 'councillors' (one), 'mayor' (one), 'elected representatives' (one), and 'people with real expertise' (one).

Ministers. Referral to actual Ministers included the Ministers of: Finance (18), Employment (14), State Owned Enterprises (14), Revenue (ten), State Services (ten), Agriculture and Fisheries (eight), Trade and Industry (six), Social Welfare (five), Health (five), Justice (four), Maori Affairs (three), Police (two), Energy (two), Transport (two), Education (one), and State (one). Descriptive terms, usually in the negative, included: 'well known Cabinet dry', 'unconvincing', 'gross error', 'incompetence', 'purist', 'shabby work', 'propaganda', 'hopeless', 'class traitor', and 'Minister of unemployment'.

Members of Parliament (general). This category was referred to as 'politician' (three), 'members' (three), and 'debating members' (one).

Managers. This group were referred to as 'chief executives' (nine), 'director-general/ general manager/commissioner' (nine), 'senior management' (three), and 'managers' (two). Usually described in positive terms such as 'sophistication', 'confident', 'man amongst men', 'competence', 'expertise', and 'elite'.

Ministerial Committee. Committees mentioned in this category included the 'Royal Commission on Social Policy' (one), 'Maori Affairs Committee' (one), and 'Legislative Advisory Committee' (one).

News Media. Specific newspapers mentioned included the 'Dominion' (four), 'Hawkes Bay Herald-Tribune' (one), 'New Zealand Herald' (one), and the 'National Business Review' (one). There was one mention of 'provincial and national newspapers'.

National Government. This category was mostly referred to as the 'National Government' (12). Some negative descriptive terms were used such as 'useless', 'reluctant to act', 'paid no heed', and 'without a cause in the world'. It was described positively on only one occasion - as the 'saviours of unemployment'.

National Party. This category was always referred to as the National Party. On one occasion it was described as 'looking towards the twenty-first century'.

Opposition Members. These people were referred to as the 'opposition' (34), and as 'members' (nine). Specific members mentioned included the Members for: Tauranga (13), Selwyn (seven), Rangitikei (five), Maramarua (three), Tamaki (three), Bay of Islands (three), Ashburton (two), Tarawera (two), Fendalton (one), Matamata (one), Marlborough (one), Pahiatua (one), Kaipara (one), Otago (one), and Waipa (one). Descriptive terms,

usually negative, included: 'political interference', 'patronising', 'bleeding all over the place', 'incapable', 'irresponsible', 'ugly face that wants voluntary unionism', 'sweeping allegations', 'extravagant language', 'headed for the gutter', 'Jeremiahs', 'Tories', 'pleading', and 'colleagues'.

Public. A wide range of names or descriptive terms were used for this group such as 'people' (23), 'New Zealanders' (20), 'Maori people' (14), 'young people' (ten), 'public' (nine), 'taxpayers' (seven), 'the nation' (five), 'community' (four), 'families' (four), 'women' (two), 'wives' (two), 'stressed children', 'forgotten New Zealanders', 'constituents', 'disadvantaged', 'rich and poor', 'voters', and 'few opportunities'.

Parliament. This category was referred to either as the 'House' (24) or 'Parliament' (16).

Prime Minister. In the majority of cases this person was referred to as 'Prime Minister (17). Descriptive terms included: 'advise', 'direct', 'unlimited power', and 'absolute right'.

State Bodies/Quangos. Names or descriptive terms mentioned for this category included: 'State Services Commission' (22), 'Labour Court' (14), 'Royal Commission' (six), 'independent authority' (six), 'central information registry' (five), 'kangaroo court' (five), 'High Court' (four), 'investigating authority' (four), 'Arbitration Court' (four), 'Higher Salaries Commission' (three), 'Rural Bank' (two), and 'complaints authority'.

Select Committee. This category were referred to as 'Select Committee' (19) or 'committee' (four).

Trade Unions/associations/guilds. This group were referred to as 'associations' (seven), 'guilds' (four), and 'unions' (three). Mention was also made to the 'Public Service Association' (ten) and the 'Combined State Unions' (three). Descriptive terms, generally in the negative, included: 'mates', 'hold the country to ransom', 'accord', 'negotiation', 'illegal', 'unlawful', 'gangsterism', 'tyranny', 'solidarity', 'conflict', 'no consultation', 'obstruct flexibility', and 'suspicious of change'.

Union Officials. Specific people were mentioned such as Jock Mathison, Mary Batchelor, Member for Pencarrow, and Rex Jones. Descriptive terms included: 'valuable knowledge and understanding', and 'actively involved in major disputes'.

Unemployed. Names or descriptive terms used for this group of people included: 'unemployed' (33), 'people' (12), 'Maori people' (11), 'social alienation' (two), 'stress or race relations', 'mental and physical stress', 'long term unemployed', 'victims', 'disadvantaged', 'dole queues', 'women must sustain economic pressure', 'squashed by the system', 'real suffering', 'growth industry', 'young unemployed', 'cancer', 'illiterate', 'inadequate education', and 'young are hurting bad'.

Other. This category included 'ex-Prime Ministers' (three), 'ex-MPs' (four), 'redundancy' (two), 'international monetary fund' (two), 'immigrants' (two), 'socialists' (one), 'shareholders' (one), 'retired people' (one), and 'iwi' (one).

5.2.9 Debating Information

In accordance with the aims of the study the title, and type of debate (i.e. introduction, report, second reading, third reading) were recorded. Where possible the mover of each debate or item of business and

her or his political affiliation was recorded, as was the outcome of the debate. This information is presented in Table 21.

Of the 61 items of business analysed, 49 items (about 80 percent) were bills. Their progress through the parliamentary process included 16 introductions, six Select Committee reports, ten second readings, and 17 third readings. Other items of business included Debate General (four), Ministerial Statement (three), Business of the House - Procedure (one), Debate Declined - Urgent Public Matter (Unemployment) (one), Point of Order - Answers to Written Questions (one), Personal Explanation (one), and Address in Reply and Proposed Amendment (one). Furthermore, 50 of the items were moved by government members and only eight by opposition members. Three items involved Debate Resumed, therefore, the original movers were not included.

A total of 21 Labour MP's moved items of business compared to four National MP's. The Labour members consisted of 12 Cabinet Ministers, three Associate Ministers, one Under-Secretary, and five Backbenchers. More specifically, Trevor de Cleene moved eight items of business, followed by Dr Michael Cullen with seven items. Peter Neilson, Richard Prebble, David Caygill, Colin Moyle, and Jonathon Hunt recorded three items of business each. Close behind were Peter Tapsell, Stanley Rodger, David Butcher, Geoffrey Palmer, Koro Wetere, and Dr William Sutton with two items each. Members who moved one item of business each included Joseph Dillon, Jack Elder, Roger Douglas, Allan Wallbank, Philip Woollaston, Geoffrey Braybrooke, and Robert Tizard.

Of the four National MP's who moved items of business, three were Spokespersons and one was a backbencher. More specifically, Winston Peters

Table 21: Title, Type, Mover, and Outcome of Each Debate or Item of Business

No.	Title	Type	Mover	Political Party	Debate Outcome
1.	State Owned Enterprises Amdt. Bill	3R	Neilson, P.	L	agreed
2.	Police Complaints Authority Bill	3R	Tapsell, P.	L	agreed
3.	Ministerial Statement - Petrocorp	-	Prebble, R.W.	L	-
4.	Police Amendment Bill	3R	Tapsell, P.	L	agreed
5.	Debate General	-	Prebble, R.W.	L	motion lapsed
6.	General Finance Ltd Bill	Report	Dillon, J.G.	L	agreed
7.	AMP Perceptual Trustee Co. Bill	2R	Roger, J.S.	L	agreed
8.	Hastings City Council (Rating Relief) Empowering Bill	Introduction	Butcher, D.J.	L	agreed
9.	NZ Post Ltd (Statement of Corporate Intent) Bill	Introduction	Carter, J.M.	N	rejected
10.	Petroleum Corporation of NZ Ltd Bill	Introduction	Kidd, D.L.	N	debate interrupted
11.	Motor Vehicle Securities Bill	Introduction	Palmer, G.W.R.	L	agreed
12.	Petroleum Sector Reform Bill	3R	Caygill, D.F.	L	agreed
13.	Debate General	-	Dunne, P.F.	L	motion lapsed
14.	Business of the House - Procedure	-	Peters, W.R.	N	-
15.	Potato Industry Act Repeal Bill	Introduction	Moyle, C.J.	L	agreed
16.	Employment (Job Creation and Working Party) Bill	Introduction	Peters, W.R.	N	debate interrupted
17.	Debate Declined - Urgent Public Matter (Unemployment)	-	Peters, W.R.	N	-
18.	Clerk of the House of Representatives Bill	2R	Hunt, J.L.	L	agreed
19.	Meat Amdt. Bill (No. 2)	3R	Moyle, C.J.	L	agreed
20.	Animal Remedies Amdt. Bill	3R	Moyle, C.J.	L	agreed
21	Taxation Reform Bill (No. 4)	2R	Debate Resumed	-	agreed
22.	Income Tax Amdt. Bill (No. 4	3R	de Cleene, T.A.	L	agreed
23.	Land Tax Amdt. Bill (No. 2)	3R	de Cleene, T.A.	L	agreed
24.	Goods and Services Tax Amdt. Bill (No. 4)	3R	de Cleene, T.A.	L	agreed
25.	Development Finance Corp. of NZ Amdt. Bill (No. 2)	2R	Caygill, D.F.	L	debate interrupted
26.	Maori Trust Boards Amdt. Bill	Introduction	Wetere, K.T.	L	agreed
27.	Dunedin City Council Endowment Lands Bill	Report	Elder, J.A.	L	agreed
28.	Clerk of the House of Representatives Bill	3R	Hunt, J.L.	L	agreed
29.	Rural Banking and Finance Corp. of NZ Bill	2R	Debate Resumed	-	agreed
30.	Appropriation Bill (No. 2) - Financial Statement	2R	Douglas, R.O.	L	debate interrupted

Table 21 ctd...

No.	Title	Type	Mover	Political Party	Debate Outcome
31.	Finance Bill (No. 3)	Introduction	Cullen, M.J.	L	agreed
32.	Customs Amdt. Bill (No. 2)	Introduction	de Cleene, T.A.	L	agreed
33.	Finance Bill (No. 3)	2R	Cullen, M.J.	L	agreed
34.	Rural Banking and Finance Corp. Amdt. Bill	3R	Cullen, M.J.	L	agreed
35.	National Provident Fund Amdt. Bill	3R	Cullen, M.J.	L	amdt rejected
36.	Social Security Amdt. Bill	3R	Cullen, M.J.	L	agreed
37.	Conservation Amdt. Bill	3R	Cullen, M.J.	L	agreed
38.	Customs Amdt. Bill (No. 2)	2R	de Cleene, T.A.	L	agreed
39.	Debate General	-	Cooper, W.E.	N	motion lapsed
40.	Ministerial Statement - Maori Fishing Rights	-	Prebble, R.W.	L	-
41.	Income Tax Amdt. Bill (No. 6)	Introduction	de Cleene, T.A.	L	agreed
42.	Social Welfare Acts Amdt. Bill	Introduction	Cullen, M.	L	agreed
43.	Development Finance Corp. of NZ Amdt. Bill	3R	Caygill, D.F.	L	agreed
44.	Ministerial Statement - Maori Affairs Estimates	-	Wetere, K.T.	L	-
45.	Meat Amdt. Bill	Introduction	Butcher, D.J.	L	agreed
46.	Point of Order - Answers to Written Questions	-	Peters, W.R.	N	-
47.	Personal Explanation - Question of the Day (No. 6)	-	Prebble, R.W.	L	-
48.	Meat Amdt. Bill	Report	Wallbank, A.	L	agreed
49.	Wheat Levies Bill	Report	Sutton, W.D.	L	agreed
50.	Wheat Producers Levy Bill	Report	Sutton, W.D.	L	agreed
51.	Taxation Reform Bill	2R	de Cleene, T.A.	L	agreed
52.	Water, Soil, and Rivers Bill	2R	Neilson, P.	L	agreed
53.	State Owned Enterprises Amdt. Bill	Introduction	Neilson, P.	L	agreed
54.	Trustee Amdt. Bill	Introduction	Woolaston, P.	L	agreed
55.	Auckland Airport Bill	Report	Braybrooke, G.B.	L	agreed
56.	Address in Reply and Proposed Amdt.	-	Debate Resumed	-	agreed
57.	Debate General	-	Peters, W.R.	N	-
58.	Wheat Levies Bill	Introduction	Tizard, R.J.	L	agreed
59.	Wages Protection and Contractors Liens Act Repeal Bill	3R	Palmer, G.W.	L	debate interrupted
60.	State Sector Bill	Introduction	Rodger, S.J.	L	agreed
61.	Labour Relations Amdt. Bill	3R	Hunt, J.H.	L	agreed

KEY: 2R = Second reading
3R = Third reading
L = Labour Party
N = National Party
amdt. = amendment

recorded five items, followed by John Carter and Douglas Kidd with two items each, and Warren Cooper with one item.

The outcome of each debate or item of business was also recorded. The results showed that there were 43 motions agreed to, two motions rejected, five debates interrupted, three motions lapsed, and eight no action/not applicable/not indicated items.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

This chapter is separated into three parts. The first part discusses the main points in relation to the amount of industrial relations coverage. Next, the actual subject matter is discussed under five sub-headings. These include: industrial relations categories and sub-categories, negotiations and communications, the object, attitude, and tone of the MP's comments, participant types, and debating information. Finally, the study is critically analysed and directions for further research are suggested.

6.1 AMOUNT OF COVERAGE

It was apparent from this investigation that industrial relations receives a good deal of attention from our politicians in the House of Representatives. As an indication of the public and political value attached to industrial relations by politicians about 12 percent of the within sample Hansard space was concerned with such matters. This is the equivalent of about 111 Hansard pages over the 12 sample sitting days or an average of around nine pages for each day. Projecting from these figures, this would mean that over the whole sample period, which comprised of 80 sitting days, the equivalent of approximately 720 pages of Hansard would be devoted to industrial relations concerns. This amount of coverage would have been even greater had all the business of the House been included in the study, especially 'Questions and Answers' which according to Palmer (1987) account for around 14 percent of the total Business of the House. Whilst on this subject it is interesting to note that the within sample

material in this study, which accounted for about 75 percent of the total Hansard space, corresponded closely with the patterns of work described in the literature review by Palmer (1978). In the Palmer study the business of the House which corresponded closely with the within sample material in this study, accounted for about 81 percent of the total Hansard space.

Considering that the proceedings of the House are broadcast live by radio and that extracts from these broadcasts are broadcast quite frequently on radio and television, the likelihood of audience contact with at least some industrial relations rhetoric from politicians in Parliament, on a given day, is reasonably high. The likelihood of further audience contact is enhanced by the Parliamentary Press Gallery who supply regular information to the news media, and by the distribution of Hansard to various libraries and other sources throughout the country. Furthermore, we know from previous studies (Cordery, 1978; Harbridge, 1984; Hartmann, 1976) that the newspapers, radio, and television devote considerable attention to industrial relations and that much of their information source is from politicians either directly or indirectly.

The results of this study, therefore, indicated that sufficient amounts of the industrial relations statements delivered by politicians in Parliament and elsewhere reach the general public daily for such information to be regarded as an important factor in the shaping of public consciousness. It is clear that in an industrial relations context politicians are involved in some of the classic functions of political language as described by Graber (1976, 1981) such as information dissemination, agenda setting, interpretation and linkage, projection to the past and future, and action stimulation. It may be more difficult for politicians to create distinct perceptual and conceptual worlds with regard to industrial relations,

compared to, say, foreign affairs where the audience usually lacks direct perceptions, prior knowledge, and resources to check new information. Nevertheless, the opportunity exists for politicians to indulge in reality creation and manipulation of expectations through verbal discourse in this area. This is particularly so because the media, rather than acting as a balance or check on the presentation of industrial relations by political elites, also indulge in their own reality creation in relation to this subject. This involves selectivity, stereotyping, conflict images, superficiality, and trivialisation (Cordery, 1978; Cordery, Jamieson, & Stacey, 1978; Glasgow Media Group, 1970; Hartmann, 1976; Morley, 1973).

There is another indication of the high public and political value which politicians attach to industrial relations. Although there was considerable overall variance in the amount of industrial relations language spoken on a given day, ranging from about one-third of a Hansard page to about 23 Hansard pages, there was, in all cases, at least some time or content devoted to industrial relations issues.

The pattern of industrial relations content for each sample month is interesting because two out of the three lowest recordings (i.e. for March and September) correspond to the finish and start respectively of the annual tripartite wage round. One possible explanation for this is that politicians at these particular times deliberately avoid speaking on those industrial relations issues which could be seen to be influencing the negotiating process. The lowest recording was in December. This could indicate a combination of the above factor along with a tendency of the House to concentrate on other important matters of debate as the legislative work load becomes greater and more rushed in preparation for the Christmas and New Year recess.

Of the three parliamentary sitting days, Thursdays had the highest average industrial relations content. It may be that on a Thursday there is slightly more opportunity within the business of the day to debate matters of an industrial relations nature. Such an opportunity certainly presents itself on a Wednesday which allows for a two hour general debate, and this may account for its having the second highest average recording.

The results showed that for each of the sample months and elected sample bills the Opposition recorded the most industrial relations content. In general the differences in amount of content between the two parties were considerable although in March and July these differences were only slight. These results highlight the combative, adversarial style of politics in the New Zealand Parliament mentioned by Palmer (1987) and others. In this case the Opposition appear to seize the opportunity to debate industrial relations issues more readily than do the Government. This pattern of verbal behaviour may also indicate the Opposition's de facto perogative to determine how long the debate will last on each issue. Here we see a balance, as mentioned by Palmer, between the interests of Government and the right of the minority in registering strong resistance to a particular measure. The absence of any industrial relations content from the Democratic party demonstrates the strength of the two party system within the House and the relative ineffectiveness of third parties in general, particularly when their representation is so small.

A complaint often heard about parliamentary debates is that politicians do not adhere to the subject under debate. It is interesting to note, therefore, that in the State Sector Bill (1R) and the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) the actual industrial relations content was very high - around 80 percent and 87 percent respectively. Although this gives no

indication as to the quality of the debate or verbal discourse, it does indicate that speakers actually kept very closely to the subject being debated and that the rules and procedures of the House in relation to debates were generally effective, at least in this example.

The results showed, as found in the Lehnen (1969) study, that politicians in Parliament do not equally avail themselves of the opportunity to speak on the floor with regard to industrial relations issues and that verbal exchange represents the activity of only some MP's - albeit a majority. A different pattern of speakers was observed between not only the sample Hansard issues and elected sample bills but also between the Government and the Opposition. Whereas the top ten Government speakers for the sample Hansard issues consisted of five Ministers/Associate Ministers, one Under-Secretary, and four backbenchers, the top ten Opposition speakers comprised nine spokespersons and only one backbencher. One possible explanation for these differences is that since the Opposition have fewer numbers, it follows that they will have more MP's with specific responsibilities, and proportionately fewer back-benchers. Another explanation may be that both parties, partly due to the attack and defence style of a majoritarian political system, and partly due to inter-party procedural differences, tend to use their spokespersons in slightly different ways. Whereas the Opposition appears to favour the specialist role of each spokesperson, the Government appears to favour a combination of specialist and generalist roles. However, this pattern is by no means invariant. It would be interesting to see if such a pattern remains consistent between the two parties, regardless of which one is in power, or if it is a Government-Opposition phenomenon independent of party differences. The

speakers for both parties in the elected sample bills all held some responsibility and could be regarded as specialists.

Whereas the Minister of Finance, Roger Douglas, recorded the highest industrial relations content for the Government, his spokesperson counterpart in the Opposition, Ruth Richardson, contribution was much less. Similarly, whereas the Associate Spokesperson on Overseas Trade, and Transport, William Storey, recorded the highest industrial relations content for the Opposition, his counterparts in the Government recorded considerably less.

Although the Opposition had fewer women members, the results showed that they availed themselves of the opportunity to speak on industrial relations more than did their Government counterparts. Of the ten women Government MP's only three scored above the median and two recorded no comments at all. On the other hand, of the three women Opposition members, two scored above the median and all three recorded some industrial relations content.

It is well known that the Senior and Junior Whips in both parties have considerable workloads within the House, thus precluding their opportunities to participate in parliamentary debate. The results of this study, at least indirectly, confirm this. The MP's with these responsibilities, in both parties, all scored below the medians.

The pattern of non-speakers in the House in relation to industrial relations is interesting. Eleven Government members were recorded as not speaking on industrial relations compared to five Opposition members. Considering both the specific portfolios and heavy workload of the Prime Minister it is hardly surprising that he recorded no industrial relations content. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition featured high in

the sample Hansard issues and also to a minor degree in the State Sector Bill (1R). One possible explanation for this difference is that the roles of Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition, irrespective of what party is in power, are quite different in the House. Whereas the Prime Minister may be expected to speak on key issues of national and international importance as well as his specialist portfolio areas, the Leader of the Opposition may be expected to lead the attack on a whole range of national, international, and legislative measures.

Another factor in the Leader of the Opposition's case is that he was a Minister of Labour in the last term of the National Government prior to the Fourth Labour Government. Another possible explanation of the Prime Minister's non-contribution to industrial relations concerns could be because of the considerable, arguably unprecedented, Government infighting between the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and their respective supporters. The strong influence that Roger Douglas had in the economic area and its overlap with industrial relations, is highlighted in this study by data which showed him recording the highest industrial relations content, and with economic concerns being the most prominent category. The Prime Minister's non-contribution in this context, therefore, may actually reflect a deliberate policy of non-participation or even non-compliance in this area, particularly with the labour market consequences of policies which the Minister of Finance was supporting.

It was expected that the Speaker of the House would record little or no industrial relations content due to the nature of his responsibilities and position. However, what about the two Ministers who had no recordings of industrial relations content, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and the Minister of Defence? One possible explanation fits in with the work of

Richards (1967) who noted that foreign affairs Ministers spend less time steering bills through parliament than do Ministers with other portfolios. According to Richards, foreign affairs is generally a matter of negotiation rather than legislation. This explanation may also, although not to the same extent, apply to the Minister of Defence. Another possible explanation, is that due to the nature of their portfolios, the Ministers concerned did not have the opportunity to comment upon industrial relations issues. Furthermore, both Ministers due to the nature of their responsibilities are more likely to be out of the country and thus spend less time in the debating chamber. However, in this respect, it is interesting to note that the Minister of Overseas Trade and Marketing, Mike Moore, although spending considerable time overseas on trade missions, recorded a small but substantial amount of industrial relations in the sample Hansard issues and a large amount of such content in the State Sector Bill (1R). He was also the member of the Government who worked at seeking an accord with the Combined Trade Unions.

In some respects it was surprising that Government backbenchers Sonja Davies, with her background in the trade union movement, and Dr Peter Simpson, with the Port of Lyttelton in his electorate, did not record any industrial relations content. This omission may reflect their unease with the labour relations policies of the Government. However, their non-contribution more than likely reflects the extent to which MP's compete for debating time and where, more often, it is those with specific responsibilities who dominate this time. The results also show that MP's with such responsibilities, with a few exceptions, recorded at least some industrial relations content. This must lend some weight to Graber's (1976) observation that politicians are very aware that in communicating with the

public, the speaker's political status is especially important, and that messages by front benchers carry an extra increment of persuasiveness when compared with those messages from less strategically placed individuals.

What about the proposition, mentioned by Lehnen (1969) that the more vocal people in the Senate (or Parliament) do so in order to gain national prestige and higher office? The fortunes or misfortunes of some Government MP's over the past three years (up until the 1990 General Election and subsequent change of Government) may, to some degree, support this proposition. Of those members who scored above the median, Geoffrey Palmer who was at the time Deputy Prime Minister became Prime Minister and subsequently resigned from this position; Michael Cullen had moved from eighteenth to sixth ranking; William Jeffries had moved from nineteenth to ninth ranking; Jonathon Hunt had moved up two - from tenth to eighth ranking; Philip Woolaston was promoted from being twenty-third ranked to fifteenth; Jim Sutton was promoted from the backbench to be ranked seventeenth; Annette King had moved up from Parliamentary Under-Secretary to thirteenth ranking; Peter Dunne had moved up from Parliamentary Under-Secretary to a Minister not in Cabinet; and Koro Wetere had moved from sixth ranking to fifth ranking. There are other members, however, who have fared less favourably. Richard Prebble, ranked fifth at the time of this study, was subsequently relegated to the backbench but then reinstated to fifth ranking under a Palmer Government and fourth ranking under a Mike Moore Government. Roger Douglas and Trevor de Cleene were demoted to the backbench. Jim Anderson has since broken away from the Labour Party and started up the New Labour Party. In the 1990 General Election he was elected as Member of Parliament for the New Labour Party in the Sydenham constituency.

It needs to be stressed, however, that the results of this investigation relate to industrial relations content only and that a different pattern may emerge if the overall verbal content spoken by each politician were taken into consideration. Furthermore, promotions or demotions to the extent described above, particularly within such a short period and whilst a Government is in power, are relatively rare in New Zealand politics. It should also be noted that some of the Government MP's who scored below the median, also subsequently gained higher office or additional responsibilities in the Fourth Labour Government. Mike Moore became Prime Minister. Helen Clark became Deputy Prime Minister. Peter Neilson and Margaret Austin gained Cabinet status (ranked sixteenth and nineteenth respectively). Noel Scott and Fred Gerbic became Ministers Not In Cabinet.

In the literature review it was noted by Horn, Leniston, and Lewis (1983) that one of the most common issues articulated for the 1980's by three Government women MP's - Helen Clarke, Margaret Shields, and Fran Wilde was unemployment. Does this articulation show through in the results of this investigation? In one sense this is difficult to determine because the information was collated in such a way that sub-categories were not matched with individual speakers. However, the results do show that on industrial relations in general, which contained a substantial amount of items on unemployment (accounting for the most prominent sub-category), these three MP's recorded very little content. It is possible, however, that such content, as little as it was, did refer to unemployment.

6.2 SUBJECT MATTER

6.2.1 Industrial Relations Categories and Sub-Categories

The results of this investigation showed a marked difference between some of those industrial relations topics considered of high public value by politicians in the House, and those topics considered of high public value by the news media. Whereas industrial action was the most prominent topic in the new media studies (Cordery, 1978; Cordery, Jamieson, & Stacey, 1978; Harbridge, 1983; Hartmann, 1976), in this study it was hardly mentioned - only four items in all, with no items recorded during the third reading of the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R). Although four different types of industrial action were mentioned, the initiators of such action were distributed equally between union-employees and employers-managers. Similarly, the geographical location of such disputes was equally spread between national and regional locations. One would have expected that, given the consistent findings in the news media studies whereby the predominant topic of industrial relations news is industrial action, and since politicians are a prime source, either directly or indirectly, of such information, the number of industrial action items would have been much greater.

There are several possible explanations for why industrial action barely warranted mention by the MP's. First, politicians due to the nature of their occupation may have a better grasp of industrial relations issues and a much wider perspective on such matters, at least publicly, compared to the narrow and, it has been suggested, biased approach presented by the news media. This explanation is to a certain extent supported by the findings in that the MP's focus on a wide range of industrial relations issues and participant types. Second, politicians may deliberately avoid any public

mention of industrial action due to the sensitivity of the topic and the public and political ramifications if they are seen to be getting involved in a dispute or having a specific opinion on such matters. It is almost as if industrial action is a taboo subject. Thus, as the results of this investigation showed, when MP's do enter the verbal realm of industrial action, they do so cautiously - in a more neutral, objective, and balanced manner.

Another possible explanation, at least from the Government's perspective, is the special relationship, albeit strained, that the Labour Party historically has with the trade union movement. Because of the sensitivity of this relationship Government members may deliberately refrain from speaking about industrial action, and when they are required to, their comments are politically neutral. A related possible explanation is the Labour Government's policy of being much less interventionist in industrial relations disputes than previous governments had been. In this context, therefore, it is interesting to note that only one out of the four industrial action comments was spoken by a Government member. Furthermore, of the four items, only one item, spoken by Opposition member Alan Meurant, mentioned both cause and effect. His verbal statement on industrial action closely resembles the sort of cliched, stereotyping associated with the news media's reporting of such events whereby employees and their organizations are the instigators, and employers the victims of such action. However, in Meurant's favour, his explanation of the dispute did cover both cause and effect and in both cases was recorded as elaborated (that is, his explanation evolved over two or more sentences).

Although industrial action was hardly mentioned, it is interesting to note the significant correlation between such action and the statements and

actions of unions-employees. Not only did this group of people receive hardly any mention, but when they were mentioned it was in association with industrial action rather than the more positive aspects of union-employee behaviour.

The economic context of industrial relations, for the sample Hansard issues, was the most prominent category, accounting for 44 percent of all of the items. This is in direct contrast to the news media's presentation of this topic where it is hardly recognised (Cordery, 1978; Hartmann, 1976). Since economic considerations are of vital importance in shaping the nature of ongoing industrial relations it is comforting to see that this is given such high priority by our politicians. However, in spite of economic factors being given such prominence, it is interesting to note that they were not mentioned at all in debates on either of the two elected sample bills. One possible explanation for this, and which has been previously mentioned, is that contrary to popular belief, politicians actually do stick closely to the subject under debate. Thus, one would expect that in relation to the State Sector Bill (1R) and the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) speakers would tend to focus on more specific considerations such as work and conditions. In fact, this was found to be the case, with the category of work and conditions accounting for around 60 percent of the subject matter in each elected sample bill.

A sub-analysis of items falling within the category of economic context showed that members generally focused on those items of high public importance, during the sample period, such as unemployment, economic well-being of a particular group, and the economic well-being of the country. Unemployment, overwhelmingly, accounted for the greatest number of items in this study, nearly twice as many as the next most prominent sub-category -

economic well-being of a particular group. The significant relationship between economic context, and political action/statements, and industrial developments was expected since politically the three factors are very closely inter-related. It was surprising, however, that the category of 'cost of living', considering its overall importance to the public, received little attention, accounting for only three items.

The question needs to be asked, "was the importance attached to economic factors in the industrial relations process given too much priority by the MP's?" This was a period when Rogernomics was at its peak and when economic and fiscal considerations appeared to rule supreme, arguably, at the expense of other social and individual considerations. The predominance of economic factors in this study may, therefore, be partly due to a conscious or unconscious acceptance of economic determinism by politicians, combined with strong party cohesion, rather than a deliberate effort on their part to portray industrial relations in a much broader economic context.

The next highest category in the sample Hansard issues was work and conditions, accounting for about 23 percent of all items. These results are in direct contrast to the news media's under-reporting of this topic (Cordery, 1978; Hartmann, 1976). Considerable attention was paid to the sub-categories of personnel, the performance and effectiveness of employers/ managers, procedures and rules, work skills and activities, and powers and responsibilities. However, little attention was paid to equally important areas such as health and safety, job satisfaction and morale, hours of work, and employee performance and effectiveness.

Another topic which received a small but modest amount of coverage in the sample Hansard issues but virtually no coverage in the elected sample

bills was industrial developments. By way of contrast, this category was considered to be under-reported by the news media (Cordery, 1978; Hartmann, 1976). A sub-analysis of items falling within the industrial developments category showed, as was expected, that the items largely focused on SOE's, Government Corporations, or Government Departments. These results reflect the massive restructuring within the state sector that was occurring during the sample period. It is surprising, therefore, that the coverage of such items in the State Sector Bill (1R) was virtually non-existent and included only one item. The significant relationship found between industrial developments and political action/statements was expected since politically they are closely inter-related.

Political action/statements also received a small but modest amount of coverage in the sample Hansard issues but relatively high coverage in the elected sample bills. In contrast, this category received a small to modest amount of coverage in the news media studies (Cordery, 1978; Hartmann, 1976). A possible explanation for the elected sample bills accounting for more items than the sample Hansard issues is that one would expect any Government bill on industrial relations, given the industrial relations framework in this country, to contain a substantial amount of political action, statements, or views. The Opposition accounted for the majority of statements in this category at a ratio of about 2:1. These results fit in with the combative, adversarial style of two-party politics previously described in the literature review, whereby it is the Opposition' function to challenge legislative measures. The results also indicate, to a certain degree, the extent to which the Government in New Zealand is a major participant in the industrial relations both as a legislator and employer. The results also highlight, although not to the degree expected, the

relative self serving nature of political discourse especially when it is certain to become a matter of public record. To some extent these results support the less obvious functions of verbal behaviour in public assemblies described by Graber (1976) such as ego inflation and personal gratification.

Negotiations and communications, notwithstanding the important role they play in the industrial relations process, received only a small amount of attention across both the sample Hansard issues and elected sample bills. In comparison, this category received a small but modest amount of attention in the news media studies (Cordery, 1978; Hartmann, 1976). A sub-analysis of negotiation and communication items showed that the Government, as was expected, featured high in negotiations either as a second or third party. Employer/management and Government negotiations received more attention than either union, employer/management, Government negotiations or union-employer/management negotiations. Interestingly, this lack of attention to union-employee negotiations or, in other words, giving priority to employer negotiations, also parallels the findings with the previously discussed sub-categories in work and conditions. Here it was found that employers took priority over employees with regards to performance and effectiveness. Overall, the topic of negotiations tended to focus on positive rather than negative outcomes. It was disappointing, but not surprising due to the political sensitivity of the topic, that wage and allowance negotiations received only a small amount of coverage.

The actions, statements, or views of both unions-employees, and employers-managers received only a small amount of attention, with no employer-manager items being recorded for either of the two elected sample bills. The news media studies (Cordery, 1978; Hartmann, 1976), in contrast, paid a large amount of attention to the actions and statements of unions and

their spokespeople - nearly as much as industrial action, but paid little attention to the action and statements of employers-managers. One possible explanation for the lack of employer-manager statements in this study, especially in the first reading of the State Sector Bill, could be the dual role of the Government as both an employer and legislator. It is possible, therefore, that in the coding process some items involving the Government as an employer were actually coded under the category of political action. Notwithstanding this, the oscillation, noted throughout the various categories, between union-employee items having predominance over employer-manager items or vice versa appears to balance itself out and is consistent with the previous observation that politicians attempt to present both parties as fairly as possible, thus being seen, publicly, to neither favour one party or the other.

Items on the actions and statements of state agencies received only a small amount of attention in both the sample Hansard issues and the first reading of the State Sector Bill and, surprisingly, no coverage in the third reading of the Labour Relations Amendment Bill. In contrast this category received a small but slightly higher coverage in the news media studies (Cordery, 1978; Hartmann, 1976). As noted in the Cordery (1978) study, these results do not reflect in any way the extent to which such agencies are an integral part of the industrial relations framework in this country. A significant relationship was found between the category of state agency and the categories of employer-manager action/statements/views, and work and conditions.

6.2.2 Negotiations/Communications

As previously mentioned this study assumes that negotiating, conflict resolution, or moderating behaviour is a desirable, positive attribute or

skill for politicians to have. Overall, the number of negotiating items recorded was low - only 25 for the sample Hansard issues, one for the State Sector Bill (1R), and two for the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R). These were spread between only 16, out of a total of 97, MP's. The Opposition accounted for the majority of such items - 16 compared to the Government's 12 items. One possible explanation for this is that since the Opposition recorded the most industrial relations content overall, then the chances are that they will also make more negotiating statements than does the Government. This explanation, at face value, appears to have some support. If we look at the rank order of the amount of industrial relations content spoken by each politician (as shown in Table 12) and compare this to those members who recorded negotiating/communicating statements there appears to be some association. Those Opposition members who recorded such statements were all ranked between second and nineteenth, whereas the Government members had a wider dispersion and were ranked from first to forty-seventh with regards to the amount of industrial relations spoken.

The relatively low recording of negotiation/communication statements by the MP's reflects, to a certain degree, the constraints of publicness on their verbal behaviour in public assemblies. They may feel compelled to make themselves appear strong and not lose face on matters of principle thus making for a good deal of posturing and working against compromise or genuine bargaining. Any display of negotiating or compromising verbal behaviour, therefore, needs to be done in a very skilful manner. The fact that at least some negotiating behaviour was recorded reflects, to some degree, the need to maintain a productive, interactive climate within the debating chamber. As pointed out by Graber (1976) an atmosphere of decorum and politeness, combined with the procedures and rules of the House, guards

against unbridled anger thus increasing the willingness of parties to cooperate and seek agreement. Some credit, therefore, must go to the 16 members who used negotiating/communication behaviour as a verbal tool and who may act as models for the potentially large audience for parliamentary debates.

6.2.3 Object, Attitude, and Tone of MP's Comments

Object. The results of this section supported the findings in previous sections that members in the debating chamber, as a general rule, keep very closely to the subject under debate. This is shown in that the overwhelming majority of comments recorded were coded as substantive, that is, pertaining to the bill or motion. Thus, the number of procedural and interruptive comments was kept to a minimum. Overall, although the results varied between the sample Hansard issues and those for each elected sample bill, the Opposition accounted for the majority of interruptive statements. This result was expected, although to a much higher degree than indicated, in spite of the attacking functions associated with the Opposition in a two-party system and the use of interruption as a verbal tool.

Attitude. Overall, the attitude of speakers towards the object of the speech were mixed. Generally favourable comments, in the sample Hansard issues, accounted for the majority of items - around 42 percent. In contrast, generally unfavourable items, in the State Sector Bill (1R) and Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) accounted for the majority of items - around 48 percent and 65 percent respectively. As would be expected in a two-party system, the majority of generally favourable comments were made by Government members and the majority of generally unfavourable comments by Opposition members. These results, once again, supporting the predictable

combative attack and defence style associated with a predominantly two-party political system.

What is surprising, however, is the large number of mixed, neutral, not ascertainable comments, accounting for 40 percent of the sample Hansard issue items, 20 percent of the State Sector Bill (1R) items, and 11 percent of the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R) items. Overall, the Opposition accounted for nearly three times as many of these comments as the Government. Similar results were found by Strickland (1969) whereby the amount of 'double-talk' in the United States' House of Representatives was used more often by the opponents of a bill than the proponents. One possible explanation for these results, in this study, and noted in the literature review, is that politicians, particularly on matters for the public record, deliberately employ half-truths or vague, ambiguous, and neutral language (Graber, 1976; Palmer, 1987; Strickland, 1969). This point perhaps becomes even more valid when we consider the period of this study. It could be argued that in some areas of policy, particularly in the economic and monetary areas, there was little distinction between the policies of the two major parties. Furthermore, the differences of opinion within the Government itself and subsequent infighting, along with considerable public opposition to many of these measures, is well documented. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that members from both parties found it necessary, for political survival, to speak in vague, ambiguous, and neutral terms.

Tone. The tone of debate or verbal discourse across both the sample Hansard issues and elected sample bills was relatively equally spread between being conflict creating and generally mixed, not ascertainable, and neutral. Whereas the Opposition accounted for the majority of conflict

creating comments, the Government accounted for slightly more of the generally mixed, not ascertainable, and neutral comments. What was noticeable was the small number of moderating comments, only 41 items overall with none recorded for the Labour Relations Amendment Bill (3R). These results, to a certain degree, fit in with the vivid description of verbal behaviour in the House by Palmer (1987) who said

> "... neither side gains any quarter and much effort is wasted in perpetual conflict..." (p.16).

Because of the importance attached to negotiating or moderating verbal behaviour in this study, it is interesting to compare the two behaviours. First, there were more moderating items than negotiation items - 42 versus 28 respectively. Second, whereas the Opposition accounted for a slight majority of the negotiation comments, the Government accounted for a large majority of the moderating comments. Third, the number of negotiating and moderating comments in the two elected sample bills was very low. Fourth, a slightly greater number of MP's indulged in moderating verbal behaviour than negotiating verbal behaviour. Whereas moderating comments were spread amongst 21 MP's, only 16 MP's displayed negotiating verbal behaviour. A final comparison is that only five out of the fifteen Government members who recorded moderating comments also recorded negotiating comments. These members were (the number of items are in brackets - negotiating items first, moderating items second): Richard Northey (3,4), William Sutton (3,3), Roger Douglas (2,2), David Butcher (1,2), and Trevor Mallard (1,1). In addition, only one out of the six Opposition members who recorded moderating comments also recorded negotiating comments, this being William Birch (4,2).

These comparisons show that politicians are more likely to indulge in moderating than negotiating verbal behaviour. It may be a matter of degree or the softer of the two options where moderating behaviour, whilst

maintaining a productive, interactive climate in the House, is also perceived to be less compromising than negotiating behaviour. The results also showed that in the case of the two elected sample bills, both at the heart of industrial relations, the two parties were unwilling to negotiate or compromise publicly on matters of principle and policy in this area.

6.2.4 Participant Types

The results of this section showed that politicians in the House were concerned with the actions or affairs of a wide range and large number of participants. Furthermore, unlike the results of the news media studies (Cordery, 1978; Cordery et al., 1978; Harbridge, 1983; Hartmann, 1976), no one participant type was overwhelmingly prominent in terms of being cited in debates. However, the spread of participant types was, as expected, greater for the sample Hansard issues than for the elected sample bills. In addition, the emphasis on participant types between the two elected sample bills although having some similarities also had several differences.

Whereas the results of the news media studies showed that news items are concerned overwhelmingly with the actions of workers and their organisations, the results of this study showed a different picture. Participant types within the top ten rankings across both the sample Hansard issues and elected sample bills included: the public, Opposition members, employees, Ministers, employee-managers, unemployed, employers (specific), Government (general), managers, Government departments/SOE's/Corporations, trade unions/associations/guilds, employers-managers, state bodies/quangos, Prime Minister, Parliament, and Government members. This wide range of participant types highlights both the interplay in politics among acts, actors, settings, and the masses as well as the complexity and various levels of public language.

At one level these results support the observation by Graber (1976) that political discourse deals with public affairs of concern to a large number of people. At the industrial relations level the three major parties - employees, employer, and the Government are mentioned frequently, with the Government being mentioned slightly more than are the other two parties. This could indicate that more legitimacy is given to the actions of the Government as an employer. However, the prominence of the Government, as mentioned previously, may be due to its dual role as both employer and legislator. At another level we have frequent mention of the Opposition and Government members emphasising the combative, adversarial role of two-party politics as well as the relatively self-serving nature of political discourse. There is also the public level. In the sample Hansard issues the public were the most prominent participant type. On the one hand politicians, in an industrial relations context, are seen to be safeguarding the interests of the public. On the other hand the politicians are electioneering and appealing to the public in general.

The number of participants quoted, only about six percent for the sample Hansard issues and one percent for the elected sample bills, is surprisingly low. Ministers, Opposition members, trade unions/ associations/guilds, and the news media were quoted the most frequently. Trade unions were quoted twice as often as employer associations. However, whereas employers-managers were quoted, employees were not. Interestingly, although the public featured prominently as a participant type, no members of the public or public groups were quoted. It was also interesting that the news media were quoted as frequently as they were, considering they were hardly mentioned in the sample Hansard issues and not mentioned at all in the two elected sample bills.

The way the various participant types were described or named gives us some insight into the nature of politicians' input into public perceptions of industrial relations issues and situations. Both employees and employers were, in general, described in neutral or positive terms. Employers, however, were presented more in terms of struggling and suffering than employees. In addition, managers were described in more successful terms than employees such as sophisticated, confident, and competent. Furthermore, when employees were mentioned in an employee-manager combination they generally had more positive adjectives describing them, such as professional, good and loyal. Trade unions were usually described in the negative. Trade union officials, however, were positively described. On the other hand, employers associations were described in very formal and neutral language. The unemployed were more often described in positive terms and as suffering a great deal of hardship. The Government and Government members were described in both negative and positive terms but Ministers were usually described in negative terms. The Minister of Finance, Roger Douglas, was referred to the most out of all the Ministers, followed by the Minister of Employment and the Minister of State Owned Enterprises. The public, in nearly all cases, were described in positive terms and usually in terms of some sort of suffering or disadvantage. However, on no occasions were they described in what they collectively or as individuals can contribute positively to society.

6.2.5 Debating Information

The majority of debates or business analysed consisted of proposed legislation - around 80 percent of all the business analysed, with the majority of bills being either introductions or third readings. This snapshot of the proceedings of the House fits in very well with one of the

functions of Parliament, described by Palmer (1987), which is to consider and pass bills into law. It also corresponds with the Government's task in the House to set the business or legislative agenda and to get its interests or policies adopted by the House. This is shown in that around six times as many of the Bills were moved by Government members as Opposition members, with the overwhelmingly majority of these being agreed to. Out of a total of 58 Government members, under half (21) moved items of business. Of the 39 Opposition members, only four members moved items of business. Of the 21 Government members, 16 had positions of responsibility, whereas of the four Opposition members, three had positions of responsibility. Trevor de Cleene moved the most items of business for the Government (eight items), with Winston Peters moving the most items of business for the Opposition (five items).

6.3 SELF CRITIQUE AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The general aims of this study, as outlined in Chapter One, were achieved. For example, the content of industrial relations language as spoken by some politicians in the House of Representatives was analysed in-depth. In addition, the general pattern of those debates with industrial relations were analysed. Furthermore, as an exploratory study, several important questions were answered such as "who participates in the debates and who does not?" and "which political party or politician was the most conciliatory in verbal behaviour?" By achieving these aims the study has contributed to several areas of research, both in industrial relations and political communication, which have been the subject of very little research in New Zealand and overseas.

There were two conditions in this study, however, which might limit the extent of legitimate generalisation. The first relates to the small number of parliamentary sitting days selected - only twelve in all (plus the two elected sample bills). Ideally, a larger sample size would have increased the external validity of the study. However, limitations on the researchers times prevented having a larger sample. As it was, the actual content analysis, including the two elected sample sitting days for the pilot study, took about nine months to complete on a part-time basis. The second condition concerns the very small number of items in some of the industrial relations sub-categories along with the high number of zero entries.

There were some lessons to be learnt from this study. It is felt that a content analysis of the magnitude undertaken is more suited to either a longer research time frame or to be performed by two or more researchers. Related to this is the fact that the data for the study were collected and collated manually. Although this was necessary for much of the descriptive data, it is felt that computer entry and analysis would have been more efficient for the quantitative data.

There are some suggestions for further research. Although this study analysed the majority of business conducted in the House, there are at least two further areas of research connected with Parliament that could shed further light on the industrial relations area. First, there are the Questions for Oral Answer which are estimated to account for about 15 percent of the total Hansard issue space. Second, it has already been noted that Hansard is not necessarily a record of all the business transacted in the House. A full record of such business is recorded in the House's Journal. Both Questions for Oral Answer and the House's Journal, therefore,

could be valuable sources for further industrial relations research. Another area for further research would be a comparison study between the present study (when a Labour Government was in power) and a similar period for when a National Government was in power.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

The results of this content analysis showed that industrial relations receives a good deal of attention from our politicians in the House of Representatives. It was concluded that, in broad terms, members tried to achieve a balance in their presentation of industrial relations and in their portrayal of the different participant types. It was also apparent that the vast majority of industrial relations subject matter was directed at economic factors, and especially at unemployment. Considerable attention was also paid to work and conditions, particularly in the personnel domain. In contrast, very little attention was paid to industrial action or conflict. Furthermore, when this topic was mentioned it was done so in a very balanced manner. Overall, it was found that members were concerned with the actions or affairs of a wide range and large number of participants, with no one participant type being overwhelmingly cited in debates. The five most mentioned participant types (in order of prominence) were the public, Opposition members, employers, Ministers, and employees-managers.

These results contrast in many ways with the news media's presentation of such matters. In the review of the literature (Chapter Two) it was noted that the vast majority of industrial relations news is directed at overt conflict and the activities of trade unions. An unbalanced presentation of the various participants and their actions is portrayed with trade unions having negative adjectives applied to them more often than any other participant types.

The contrast between the results of this study and those of the news media studies (Cordery, 1978; Harbridge, 1984; Hartmann, 1976) is rather interesting. Given that the Government is a prime source of information for the news media, one might have expected that there would have been more similarities than differences in the results from such studies. The reasons for these differences cannot really be answered here. While suggestions may be made, such questions require separate investigation by different means. For example, the public speeches of politicians in forums other than Parliament, as well as their press release speeches could be examined with regards to industrial relations subject matter. These could then be compared with media reports of these events or with the results of this study, and those of the news media studies. This would give some indication as to whether the differential legitimacy so apparent in the news media studies is in part due to a combination of reporter and politician attitude and perceptions or solely the attitudes and perceptions of the reporters.

It can also be concluded from this study that the tone of verbal discourse in the House, relating to industrial relations, was either conflict creating or generally mixed, not ascertainable, and neutral. It is evident that the two major parties rarely display negotiating or moderating behaviour and that they engage in a great deal of "double-talk". This type of verbal behaviour no doubt contributes to the commonly held view that debate in public assemblies such as Parliament is irrational, irresponsible, and degenerative.

It is to the politicians' credit that they appear to achieve a balance in their verbal presentation of industrial relations. However, the results showed that there is still plenty of room for improvement. They could focus

more on the vital area of negotiations and on the important role that state agencies have within the industrial relations framework in this country. Their language need not be so self-serving and could be better directed towards other more important issues such as occupational safety, and the more constructive aspects of employee-employer behaviour. Moderating verbal behaviour should not be perceived by members as a weakness but as a tool for enhancing the debating process.

The results of this investigation also highlight the complexity of political language. Politicians speak not only to a wide variety of audiences but also on a number of different levels. At one level they may be addressing the concerns of one or more of the three major players in industrial relations. On another level they may be appealing to the public for support on an issue. On yet another level they may be electioneering and pursuing their own career ambitions.

It seems almost certain that the nature of industrial relations language, as identified in this study, will have some effect on public perceptions both in the industrial relations area and in the domain of parliamentary debate. Thus, it is suggested that politicians when in the House pay greater attention to the more constructive aspects of industrial relations specifically and to verbal discourse in general.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, J. (1966). Review of Corlu, A. Recherches sur les mots relatifs a l'idee de priére d Homêre aux tragigues. In Black, M. (ed) Political language and oratory in traditional society. London: Academic Press.

Arora, S.K., & Laswell, H.D. (1969). Political communication: The public language of political elites in India and the United States. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston Inc.

Atkinson, J.M. (1984). Our masters' voices: The language and body language of politics. London: Methuen.

Babbie, E.R. (1979). The practice of social research, 2nd ed. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Beharrell, P., & Philo, G. (1977) (eds). Trade unions and the media. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Berelson, B. (1954). Content analysis. In Lindsey G. (ed) Handbook of social psychology. In Cordery, L.J. Industrial relations in the New Zealand news media. University of Canterbury. (Thesis: M.Sc.; Psychology).

Berelson, B. (1971). Content analysis in communication research. New York: Hafner Publishing Co.

Berstein, B. and Henderson, D. (1969). Social class differences in the relevance of language to socialisation. Sociology, 3(1).

Bloch, M. (1974). Symbols, song, dance, features of articulation. Is religion an extreme form of traditional authority? In Bloch, M. (ed) Political language and oratory in traditional society. London: Academic Press.

Bloch, M. (1975) (ed). Political language and oratory in traditional society. London: Academic Press.

Chermesh, R. (1982). Press criteria for strike reporting: Counting or selective presentation? Social Science Research, 11, 88-101.

Chesebro, J.W. (1976). Political communication. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62 (October), 289-300.

Constitution Act 1986. Wellington: Government Printer.

Cordery, L.J. (1978). Industrial relations in the New Zealand news media. University of Canterbury. (Thesis: M.Sc.; Psychology).

Cordery, J., Jamieson, B., & Stacey, B. (1978). Industrial relations as news. New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations, 3(2), 55-62

Cotta, M. (1974). A structural framework for the analysis of unicameral and bicameral Parliaments. In Jackson, K. The dilemma of Parliament. Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

Crick, B. (1968). The reform of Parliament. In Jackson, K. The dilemma of Parliament. Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

Edelman, M.J. (1967). The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Frank, N.S. (1973). Message dimensions of television news. In Cordery, L.J. Industrial Relations in New Zealand news media. University of Canterbury (Thesis: M.Sc.: Psychology).

Friedham, R.L., Kadane, J.B., Gamble, J.K. (Jr) (1970). Quantitative content analysis of the United Nations seabed debate: Methodology and a Continental Shelf case study. International Organisation, 24, 479-502.

Geare, A.J. (1983). The system of industrial relations in New Zealand. Wellington: Butterworths.

Glasgow Media Group (1970). Bad news. Theory and Society, 3(3), 339-363.

Graber, D.A. (1969). Perceptions of Middle East conflict in the United Nations, 1953-1965. Conflict Resolution, 13(4), 454-483.

Graber, D.A. (1970). Conflict images: An assessment of the Middle East debates in the United Nations. The Journal of Politics, 32, 339-378.

Graber, D.A. (1976). Verbal behaviour and politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Graber, D.A. (1981) Political languages. In Nimmo, D.D., & Sanders, K.R. (eds) Handbook of political communication. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.

Harbridge, R.J. (1983). The treatment of industrial relations in three major New Zealand newspapers. New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations, 8, 11-21.

Harbridge, R.J. (1984). The treatment of industrial relations in three major New Zealand newspapers: A reply. New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations, 9, 49-50.

Hartmann, P. (1976). Industrial relations in the news media. Industrial Relations Journal, 6(4), 4-18.

Herman, V. (1973). Adjournment debates in the House of Commons. Parliamentary Affairs, 26, 92-104.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Horn, P., Leniston, M., & Lewis, P. (1983). The maiden speeches of New Zealand women Members of Parliament. Political Science, 35(2), Dec., 229-265.

Jackson, K. (1987). The dilemma of Parliament. Wellington: Allen & Unwin/ Port Nicholson Press.

Kelson, R.N. (1964). The Private Member of Parliament and the formation of public policy: A New Zealand case study. University of Western Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Laswell, L.D., Lerner, D., & Pool, I. de Sola (1952). The comparative study of symbols. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lehnen, R.G. (1969). Behaviour on the Senate floor: An analysis of debate in the United States Senate. Midwest Journal of Political Science, 11, 505-521.

Levine, S. (1975) (ed). New Zealand politics: A reader. Melbourne: Cheshire.

Levine, S. (1975). Values and politics: A content analysis of party programmes. In Levine, S. (ed) New Zealand politics: A reader. Melbourne: Cheshire.

Levine, S. (1979). The New Zealand political system: Politics in a small society. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

Lijphart, A. (1984). Democracies. In Jackson, K. The dilemma of Parliament. Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

Maharey, S. (1977). Industrial relations in the press. In Cordery, L.J. Industrial relations in the New Zealand news media. University of Canterbury. (Thesis: M.Sc.; Psychology).

Marshall, J. (Sir) (1978) (ed). The reform of Parliament. Papers presented in memory of Dr Alan Robinson. Wellington: Government Printing Office.

McGee, D. (1985). Parliamentary practice in New Zealand. Wellington: Government Printer.

Morley, D. (1973). Industrial conflict and the mass media. In Cordery, L.J. Industrial relations in the New Zealand news media. University of Canterbury. (Thesis: M.Sc.; Psychology).

Mueller, C. (1973). The politics of communication: A study in the political sociology of language, socialisation, and legitimation. New York: Oxford University Press.

New Zealand Official Year Book (1987-88). Wellington: Department of Statistics.

New Zealand Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) (1987-88). First session, forty-second Parliament. Wellington: V.R. Ward, Government Printer.

- Tuesday 6 October 1987 Hansard No.3, 377-442.
- Wednesday 7 October 1987 Hansard No.3, 443-506.
- Wednesday 11 November 1987 Hansard No.6, 962-1026.
- Tuesday 1 December 1987 Hansard No.9, 1381-1418.
- Thursday 3 December 1987 Hansard No.9, 1482-1539.
- Tuesday 8 December 1987 Hansard No.10, State Sector Bill (1R), 1748-1761.
- Wednesday, 2 March 1988 Hansard No.13, 2440-2468.
- Thursday, 3 March 1988 Hansard No.13, 2469-2530.
- Tuesday, 22 March 1988 Hansard No.15, Labour Relations Amdt. Bill (3R), 3031-3038.
- Tuesday 3 May 1988 Hansard No.19, 3850-3890.
- Wednesday 4 May 1988 Hansard No.19, 3891-3956.
- Tuesday 14 June 1988 Hansard No.21, 4305-4371.
- Tuesday 26 July 1988 Hansard No.26, 5377-5498.
- Thursday 28 July 1988 Hansard No.26, 5499-5729.
- Thursday 8 September 1988 Hansard No.30, 6456-6482.
- Wednesday 21 September 1988 Hansard No.32, 6791-6873.

Nimmo, D.D., & Sanders, K.R. (1981) (eds). Handbook of political communication. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication.

Orwell, G. (1954). Politics and the English language. In Edelman, M.J. The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Packenham, R.A. (1970). Legislatures and political development. In Kornberg, A. & Musolf, L.D. Legislatures in developmental perspective. In Jackson, K. The dilemma of Parliament. Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

Page, W. (1984). The treatment of industrial relations in three major New Zealand newspapers: A journalist's comment. New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations, 9, 45-47.

Palmer, G. (1987). Unbridled power: An interpretation of New Zealand's Constitution and Government (2nd ed). Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Richards, P.G. (1967). Parliament and foreign affairs. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. Ch. 1, 5, 6, 7.

Robinson, A. (1969). Notes on New Zealand politics. Victoria University of Wellington.

Schegloff, E.A. (1972). Sequencing of conversational openings. In Gumperz, J.J., & Hymes, D. Sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication. In Bloch, M. (ed) Political language and oratory in traditional society. London: Academic Press.

Skene, G.T. (1985). Parliament: Reassessing its role. In Gold, H. (ed) New Zealand politics in perspective. In Jackson, K. The dilemma of Parliament. Wellington: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

Snyder, D., & Kelly, W.R. (1977). Conflict intensity, media sensitivity and the validity of newspaper data. American Sociological Review, 42(Feb), 105-123.

Standing Orders of the House of Representatives (1986). Wellington: Government Printer.

Strickland, D.A. (1969). On ambiguity in political rhetoric: Defeat of the Rat Control Bill in the House of Representatives, July 1967. Canadian Journal of Political Science, 2(3), September, 338-344.

Wilson, J. (1983). The professionals: A study of women in Parliament. Political Science, 35(2), Dec., 198-228.

Appendix 1

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FIRST SESSION—FORTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT, 1987

Speaker—Hon. KERRY BURKE.
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—Mr J. J. TERRIS.
Prime Minister—Rt. Hon. DAVID LANGE.
Leader of the Opposition—Hon. J. B. BOLGER.

LABOUR

Anderton, James Patrick, Sydenham.
Austin, Margaret Elizabeth (**Senior Whip**), Yaldhurst.
Bassett, Hon. Dr Michael Edward Rainton, Te Atatu.
Boorman, Reginald George, Wairarapa.
Braybrooke, Geoffrey Bernard, Napier.
Burke, Hon. Thomas Kerry, West Coast.
Butcher, Hon. David John, Hastings.
Caygill, Hon. David Francis, St. Albans.
Clark, Hon. Helen Elizabeth, Mt Albert.
Cullen, Hon. Dr Michael John, St. Kilda.
Davies, Sonja Margaret Loveday, O.N.Z., Pencarrow.
de Cleene, Hon. Trevor Albert, Palmerston North.
Dillon, Joseph Gilbert, Hamilton East.
Douglas, Hon. Roger Owen, Manurewa.
Dunne, Peter Francis, Ohariu.
Duynhoven, Harry James, New Plymouth.
Elder, Jack Arnold, West Auckland.
Fraser, Lowson Anne, East Cape.
Gerbic, Frederick Miroslav, Onehunga.
Goff, Hon. Philip Bruce, Roskill.
Gregory, Dr Bruce Craig, Northern Maori.
Hunt, Hon. Jonathan Lucas, New Lynn.
Jeffries, Hon. William Patrick, Heretaunga.
Keall, Judith Mary, Glenfield.
Kelly, Graham Desmond, Porirua.
King, Annette Faye, Horowhenua.
Kirk, Jennifer Norah, Birkenhead.
Lange, Rt. Hon. David Russell, Mangere.
Mallard, Trevor Colin (**Junior Whip**), Hamilton West.
Marshall, Hon. Cedric Russell, Wanganui.
Matthewson, Clive Denby, Dunedin West.
Maxwell, Ralph Kerr, Titirangi.
Moore, Hon. Michael Kenneth, Christchurch North.
Moyle, Hon. Colin James, Otara.
Neilson, Hon. Peter, Miramar.
Northey, Richard John, Eden.
Palmer, Rt. Hon. Geoffrey Winston Russell, Christchurch Central.
Prebble, Hon. Richard William, Auckland Central.
Robertson, Harold Valentine Ross, Papatoetoe.
Robinson, David John, Manawatu.
Rodger, Hon. Stanley Joseph, Dunedin North.
Scott, Noel, Tongariro.
Shields, Hon. Margaret Kerslake, Kapiti.
Shirley, Kenneth Lex, Tasman.
Simpson, Peter Alan, Lyttelton.
Sutherland, Larry Walter, Avon.
Sutton, James Robert, Waitaki.
Sutton, Dr William David, Hawke's Bay.
Tapsell, Hon. Peter, M.B.E., Eastern Maori.
Tennet, Patricia Elizabeth, Island Bay.
Terris, John James, Western Hutt.
Tirikatene-Sullivan, Hon. Tini Whetu Marama, Southern Maori.
Tizard, Rt. Hon. Robert James, Panmure.
Wallbank, Allan Robert, Gisborne.
Wetere, Hon. Koro Tainui, Western Maori.
Wilde, Hon. Frances Helen, Wellington Central.
Woollaston, Hon. Philip Tosswill Edmond, Nelson.
Young, Trevor James, Eastern Hutt.

NATIONAL

Anderson, Robert Arnold, Kaimai.
Angus, Derek Alan, Wallace.
Banks, John Archibald, Whangarei.
Birch, Hon. William Francis, Maramarua.
Bolger, Hon. James Brendan, King Country.
Burdon, Philip Ralph, Fendalton.
Carter, John McGregor, Bay of Islands.
Cooper, Hon. Warren Ernest, Otago.
East, Paul Clayton, Rotorua.
Falloon, Hon. John Howard, Pahiatua.
Gair, Hon. George Frederick, North Shore.
Gerard, Richard James, Rangiora.
Graham, Douglas Arthur Montrose, Remuera.
Grant, Jeffrey James, Awarua.
Gray, Robert McDowall (**Senior Whip**), Clutha.
Kidd, Douglas Lorimer, Marlborough.
Kyd, Warren James, Clevedon.
Lee, Graeme Ernest, Hauraki.
Luxton, Murray John Finlay, Matamata.
McClay, Roger Neville, Waikaremoana.
McCully, Murray Stuart, East Coast Bays.
McKinnon, Donald Charles, Rodney.
McLean, Ian, Tarawera.
McTigue, Maurice Patrick (**Junior Whip**), Timaru.
Marshall, Denis William Anson, Rangitikei.
Maxwell, Roger Francis Hamilton, Taranaki.
Meurant, Alan Ross, Hobson.
Muldoon, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert David, G.C.M.G., C.H., Tamaki.
Munro, Robert John Sutherland, Invercargill.
O'Regan, Katherine Victoria, Waipa.
Peters, Winston Raymond, Tauranga.
Richardson, Ruth Margaret, Selwyn.
Shipley, Jennifer Mary, Ashburton.
Smith, Dr Alexander Lockwood, Kaipara.
Storey, William Robson, Waikato.
Upton, Simon David, Raglan.
Wellington, Hon. Mervyn Langlois, Papakura.
Williamson, Maurice Donald, Pakuranga.
Young, Hon. Venn Spearman, Waitotara.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS

Clerk of House of Representatives—D. G. McGEE.
Parliamentary Librarian—D. I. MATHESON.
Editor of Parliamentary Debates—E. EDWARDS.
Serjeant-at-Arms—C. R. RANKIN.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod—Wing Commander M. H. S. INNES-JONES, O.B.E.

Source: Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) 1987, September No.1.

Appendix 2

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

His Excellency the Most Reverend Sir Paul Alfred Reeves, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.

THE MINISTRY

Rt. Hon. DAVID LANGE—
Prime Minister, Minister of Education, Minister in charge of the New Zealand Intelligence Service.

Rt. Hon. GEOFFREY PALMER—
Deputy Prime Minister, Attorney-General, Minister of Justice, Minister for the Environment, Minister responsible for the Audit Department.

Hon. MIKE MOORE—
Minister of Overseas Trade and Marketing, Minister in charge of Publicity.

Hon. R. O. DOUGLAS—
Minister of Finance.

Hon. RICHARD PREBBLE—
Minister for State-owned Enterprises, Minister of Works and Development, Minister of Railways, Minister of Pacific Island Affairs, Postmaster-General, Minister of Broadcasting, responsibility for Air New Zealand Ltd., Government Computing Service, Government Life Insurance Corporation, Government Printing Office, Government Property Services Ltd, Minister in charge of Public Trust Office, Rural Banking and Finance Corporation, Shipping Corporation of New Zealand Ltd, State Insurance Office.

Hon. K. T. WETERE—
Minister of Maori Affairs.

Hon. DAVID CAYGILL—
Minister of Health, Minister of Trade and Industry.

Hon. RUSSELL MARSHALL—
Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister for Disarmament and Arms Control.

Hon. Dr MICHAEL BASSETT—
Minister of Internal Affairs, Minister of Local Government, Minister of Civil Defence, Minister of Arts and Culture.

Hon. JONATHAN HUNT—
Minister of State, Leader of the House.

Rt. Hon. R. J. TIZARD—
Minister of Defence, Minister of Science and Technology.

Hon. COLIN MOYLE—
Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries.

Hon. STAN RODGER—
Minister of Labour, Minister of Immigration, Minister of State Services.

Hon. P. B. GOFF—
Minister of Employment, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Tourism, Associate Minister of Education.

Hon. MARGARET SHIELDS—
Minister of Women's Affairs, Minister of Consumer Affairs, Minister of Statistics.

Hon. PETER TAPSELL—
Minister of Police, Minister of Forestry, Minister of Lands, Minister of Recreation and Sport, Minister of Survey and Land Information, Minister in charge of the Valuation Department.

Hon. HELEN CLARK—
Minister of Housing, Minister of Conservation.

Hon. Dr M. CULLEN—
Minister of Social Welfare, Associate Minister of Finance, Minister in charge of War Pensions.

Hon. W. P. JEFFRIES—
Minister of Transport, Minister of Civil Aviation and Meteorological Services.

Hon. DAVID BUTCHER—
Minister of Energy, Minister of Regional Development, Associate Minister of Finance.

Hon. T. A. de CLEENE—
Minister of Revenue, Minister of Customs.

Hon. FRAN WILDE—
Associate Minister of Foreign Affairs, Associate Minister of Housing, Associate Minister of Conservation.

Hon. P. T. E. WOOLLASTON—
Associate Minister assisting the Deputy Prime Minister, Associate Minister of Justice, Associate Minister for the Environment.

Hon. PETER NEILSON—
Associate Minister of Finance, Associate Minister for State-owned Enterprises, Associate Minister of Works and Development.

PARLIAMENTARY UNDER-SECRETARIES

Mr P. F. DUNNE—
Parliamentary Under-Secretary to Minister of Health, Minister of Trade and Industry.

Mr F. M. GERBIC—
Parliamentary Under-Secretary to Minister of Transport, Minister of Civil Aviation and Meteorological Services, Minister of Immigration.

Mrs A. F. KING—
Parliamentary Under-Secretary to Minister of Employment, Minister of Youth Affairs, Minister of Tourism, Minister of Social Welfare.

Mr R. K. MAXWELL—
Parliamentary Under-Secretary to Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Fisheries.

Source: Parliamentary Debate (Hansard) (1987). First Session, Forty-Second Parliament, No.1.

Appendix 3

ALLOCATION OF NATIONAL PARTY SPOKESPERSONS

ANNOUNCED BY THE HON J.B. BOLGER, LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

ON THE 11 SEPTEMBER 1987

1. Hon J B Bolger	Foreign Affairs / SIS
2. Mr D C McKinnon	Health / Defence Associate Finance
3. Hon W F Birch	Labour / State Services / Immigration Pacific Island Affairs (Leader of the House - Opp)
4. Ruth Richardson	Finance
5. Mr P C East	Attorney-General / Justice / Constitutional issues
6. Hon J H Falloon	Agriculture - Horticulture / Rural Bank
7. Mr D L Kidd	Fishing / Regional Development / Inland Revenue / Associate Finance
8. Mr W R Peters	Maori Affairs / Employment
9. Mr P R Burdon	Trade & Industry / Customs
10. Mr S D Upton	Science & Technology / Arts / Associate Finance (Social Policy)
11. Mr I McLean	SOE's / Forests & Lands / Post Office/ Works & Development
12. Hon W E Cooper	Overseas Trade / Transport
13. Mr J A Banks	Tourism / Police / Recreation & Sports
14. Mr D A M Graham	Disarmament / Broadcasting / Associate T & I / Associate SOE
15. Dr L Smith	Education
16. Hon V S Young	Social Welfare / Consumer Affairs/ Statistics
17. Mr R N McClay	Housing / Associate Education / Conservation & Environment

18.	Mrs K V O'Regan	Women's Affairs / Family issues / Youth Affairs / Assoc. Health
19.	Mr G E Lee	Local Government / Internal Affairs / Civil Defence / Wildlife / Misuse of Drugs
20.	Hon M L Wellington	Energy
	Hon G Gair	Special Projects (ACC)
	Mr D A Angus	Assoc. Lands, Forests & Regional Development
	Mr W R Storey	Assoc. Overseas Trade & Assoc. Transport
	Mr R F H Maxwell	Associate Employment, Labour, State Services, Immigration
	Mr R J Gerard	Assoc. Social Welfare / Assoc. Consumer Affairs / Assoc. Statistics
	Mr D W A Marshall	Assoc. Ag./Horticulture / Rural Bank
	Mr R M Gray	Senior Whip
	Mr M McTigue	Junior Whip

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS DO NOT HAVE SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES:

Rt Hon Sir R Muldoon

Mr R A Anderson

Mr J M Carter

Mr J J Grant

Mr W J Kyd

Mr M J F Luxton

Mr M S McCully

Mr A R Meurant

Mr R J S Munro

Mrs J Shipley

Mr M D Williamson

Source: Christchurch North Electorate Office 1990

Appendix 4

PARLIAMENTARY SELECT COMMITTEES

SELECT COMMITTEES

Business—Mr Terris (Chair), Mr Gray, Trevor Mallard.

Commerce and Marketing—Dr Bill Sutton (Chair), Mr Burdon, Harry Duynhoven, Mr Graham, H. V. Ross Robertson.

Communications and Road Safety—Mr Braybrooke (Chair), Margaret Austin, Hon. Warren Cooper, Jenny Kirk, Mr Storey.

Education and Science—Noel Scott (Chair), Sonja Davies, Graham Kelly, Dr Lockwood Smith, Mr Upton.

Electoral Law—Richard Northey (Chair), John Luxton, Murray McCully, Mr McKinnon, Dave Robinson, Larry Sutherland, Hon. Mrs T. W. M. Tirikatene-Sullivan.

Finance and Expenditure—Mr J. R. Sutton (Chair), Mr Doug Kidd, Clive Matthewson, Ruth Richardson, Elizabeth Tennet.

Foreign Affairs and Defence—Mr Anderton (Chair), Hon. J. B. Bolger (Foreign Affairs), Mr Braybrooke, Sonja Davies, Mr Graham, Mr McKinnon (Defence).

Government Administration—Clive Matthewson (Chair), Mr McKinnon, Mr McLean, H. V. Ross Robertson, Dr Peter Simpson.

Internal Affairs and Local Government—Jack Elder (Chair), Mr Anderton, Mr Boorman, John Carter, Mr Lee.

Justice and Law Reform—Bill Dillon (Chair), Paul East, Jenny Kirk, Mr R. J. S. Munro, Richard Northey.

Labour—Anne Fraser (Chair), Hon. W. F. Birch, Mr Gerbic, Graham Kelly, Mr R. F. H. Maxwell.

Maori Affairs—Dr Gregory (Chair), Warren Kyd, Winston Peters, Noel Scott, Hon. Mrs T. W. M. Tirikatene-Sullivan.

Planning and Development—Ken Shirley (Chair), Mr McClay, Dave Robinson, Larry Sutherland, Hon. M. L. Wellington.

Primary Production—Mr Wallbank (Chair), Hon. J. H. Falloon, Denis Marshall, Ralph Maxwell, Ken Shirley.

Privileges—Hon. W. F. Birch, Hon. Jonathan Hunt, Mr Doug Kidd, Rt. Hon. David Lange, Rt. Hon. Geoffrey Palmer.

Regulations Review—Mr Graham (Chair), Bill Dillon, Jenny Shipley, Elizabeth Tennet, Mr T. J. Young.

Social Services—Judy Keall (Chair), Mr Dunne, Mr Gerard, Annette King, Mr McKinnon (Health), Hon. V. S. Young (Social Welfare).

Standing Orders—Hon. Kerry Burke (Chair), John Banks, Mr Gray, Hon. Jonathan Hunt, Mr McTigue, Trevor Mallard, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Muldoon, Rt. Hon. Geoffrey Palmer, Mr Terris.

Source: Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) (1987) First Session, Forty-Second Parliament, No.1.

Appendix 5

Training of a Separate Coder for Reliability Testing

Tests for inter-coder reliability were sought in three specific areas of the study, namely, subject matter coding, the coding of object, attitude, and tone of comments, and the coding of participant types.

The trainee coder was explained the aims of the study and given a brief background to the two major areas under investigation: industrial relations, and political communication. Content analysis as a research technique was then explained as was the concept and importance of reliability testing. Next, the trainee was given a questionnaire which contained a list of the various subject matter categories to be tested for inter-coder reliability. This list was then explained in detail as was the actual coding process. The trainee was then asked to code ten percent of the items, selected at random, for each sample Hansard sitting day. At the end of each trial the results were then compared with the original coding. Those items which generated disagreement were discussed and resolved.